
READING FRAMEWORK

for the

2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress

PRE-PUBLICATION EDITION

2005

Prepared for the

**National Assessment Governing Board
In support of Contract No. ED-02-R-0007**

**American Institutes for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007**

PREFACE BY THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT GOVERNING BOARD

In a modern society the ability to read well is the cornerstone of a child's education. In a modern economy literacy is a prerequisite for a successful life.

In the early years of schooling, children learn to draw meaning and pleasure from the words on a page, which gives them a sense of accomplishment. Throughout their schooling, reading is the critical skill they use for learning in all parts of the curriculum. For adults, reading is a key means to learn and do our jobs; it is also a source of enjoyment and an essential way we connect with family, friends, and the world around us. The ability to read critically and analytically is crucial for effective participation in America's democratic society.

This *Reading Framework for the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress* sets forth the design of a test of reading comprehension. The exam requires students to read passages of written English text—either literary or informational—and to answer questions about what they have read. In some cases, the questions deal with facts in the text or vocabulary. In other cases, a complete answer requires a clear analysis or coherent argument supported by sound evidence from the text.

This is the second Reading Framework approved by the National Assessment Governing Board. It will replace the Reading Framework that has been used in NAEP since 1992, and will start a new trend. The new Reading Framework is the result of extraordinary effort and commitment by hundreds of persons across the country, including some of the nation's leading figures in reading research, assessment, and instruction.

The new Reading Framework incorporates the following key features:

- Its design is based on current scientific research in reading. In keeping with Board policy, it does not advocate a particular approach to instruction, but focuses on important, measurable indicators of student achievement.
- The Framework is consistent with the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. It will enable NAEP to carry out its important role in that law as a uniform, independent measure of reading achievement in each state at grades 4 and 8.
- The Framework's content and preliminary achievement standards at grade 12 embody reading and analytical skills the project committees believe are needed for rigorous college-level courses and other productive postsecondary endeavors.
- In preparing the Framework, extensive use was made of international reading assessments and exemplary state standards.
- For the first time in NAEP, vocabulary is measured explicitly. Word meanings will be tested in context, and enough vocabulary items will be included to report useful information on the extent of vocabulary knowledge.

-
- Poetry is assessed in grade 4, as well as in grades 8 and 12. Previously, NAEP assessed poetry in grades 8 and 12 only. Poetry is a form of text that is rich in meaning and involves a high level of abstraction in language and ideas.
 - Multiple-choice and constructed-response items (both short and extended) are included at all grades. In grades 8 and 12, students will be expected to spend about 60 percent of assessment time on constructed-response questions; at grade 4, about 50 percent.
 - Descriptions of reading material to be used in the assessment and target skills to be tested are delineated in a series of charts that provide clear guidance to those developing the assessment, as well as clear information to the public.
 - Achievement will be reported on an overall cross-grade scale, allowing NAEP to show the development of reading skills through the years of schooling as well as the wide variations in particular grades. Clear standards for grade level-expectations will be established.
 - Separate subscales will be reported for literary and informational text, as has been done on international reading assessments.

The Governing Board thanks the hundreds of individuals and organizations whose time and talents contributed to this Reading Framework.

The framework process was conducted through a contract with American Institutes for Research (AIR). Both AIR and another organization, the Education Leaders Council, prepared literature reviews and issues papers, which provided different perspectives and served as the basis for extensive discussions by the Reading Framework Steering and Planning Committees. These committees, working over 14 months, included teachers, reading researchers, local and state policy-makers, testing experts, and business and public representatives. Many have played important roles in other major projects, including the National Reading Panel, international reading assessments, the RAND Reading Study Group, and the American Diploma Project.

In addition, the Governing Board convened an independent external review panel, comprised of eminent reading scholars, authors, and curriculum specialists. Their charge was to conduct an in-depth analysis of the Framework draft, including its research base and design. These individuals played an important role in shaping the Framework adopted by the Governing Board. The Board also received wide comment on the draft Framework through Internet reviews, a public forum in Washington, DC, and numerous meetings with state and local educators and policy-makers across the country.

We believe the Framework will provide a rich and accurate measure of the reading comprehension and analytical skills that students need both for their schooling and for their lives. Development of these reading skills is the responsibility of all teachers—not only English teachers but teachers across the curriculum—and also involves the expectations of parents and society.

The Governing Board hopes that this Reading Framework will serve not only as a significant national measure of how well students read, but also as a catalyst to improve reading achievement for the benefit of students themselves and for our nation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As the ongoing national indicator of what American students know and can do, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in Reading regularly collects achievement information on representative samples of students in grades 4, 8, and 12. Through the “Nation’s Report Card,” the NAEP Reading Assessment reports how well students perform in reading various texts and responding to those texts by answering multiple-choice and constructed-response questions. The information NAEP provides about student achievement helps the public, educators, and policymakers understand strengths and weaknesses in student performance and make informed decisions about education.

The 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will measure national, regional, state, and subgroup achievement in reading but is not designed to report individual student or school performance. The assessment will measure students’ reading comprehension and their ability to apply vocabulary knowledge to assist them in comprehending what they read. The public will have access to performance results and released questions through NAEP reports and Web sites.

This document, the *Reading Framework for the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress*, presents the conceptual base for and discusses the content of the assessment. It is intended for a broad audience. A more detailed, technical document, the *Reading Assessment and Item Specifications for the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress*, will also be published. The Specifications will provide information to guide passage selection, item development, and other aspects of test development. Both the Framework and the Specifications will be available to the public following approval by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB).

The recommended 2009 NAEP Reading Framework is consistent with current *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) legislation. In accordance with NCLB, the NAEP Reading Assessment will be administered every two years at grades 4 and 8, and the resulting data will be widely reported in a timely fashion. Since the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will start a new trendline, NAGB decided to delay implementation of the new Framework from 2007 to 2009. This will enable states to obtain three years of NAEP reading data at grades 4 and 8 under NCLB—2003, 2005, and 2007—under the old framework. In addition, NAEP will assess and report grade 12 reading results every four years.

The National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB)—the policy-making body for NAEP—has stated that the NAEP Reading Assessment will measure reading comprehension by asking students to read passages written in English and to answer questions about what they have read. The Framework “shall not endorse or advocate a particular pedagogical approach, ...but shall focus on important, measurable indicators of student achievement.”¹ Although broad implications for instruction may be inferred from the assessment, NAEP does not specify how reading should be taught, nor does it prescribe a particular curricular approach to teaching reading.

The 2009 NAEP Reading Framework recommendations result from the work of many individuals and organizations involved in reading and reading education, including researchers, policymakers, educators, and other members of the public. Their work was guided by scientifically

¹National Assessment Governing Board. (2002, May). *National Assessment Governing Board Policy on Framework Development*. Washington, DC: Author.

based literacy research that conceptualizes reading as a dynamic cognitive process, as reflected in the following definition of reading:

Reading is an active and complex process that involves

- understanding written text;
- developing and interpreting meaning; and
- using meaning as appropriate to type of text, purpose, and situation.

This definition applies to the assessment of reading achievement on NAEP and is not intended to be an inclusive definition of reading or of reading instruction.

Text Types

The 2009 NAEP Reading Framework recognizes that reading behaviors such as recognizing and using features of text, making sense of sentences and paragraphs, and comprehending vocabulary occur regardless of text type. However, other reading behaviors vary with the type of text encountered by a reader. Thus, the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework recommends that two types of texts be included on the assessment: literary texts, which include fiction, literary nonfiction, and poetry; and informational texts, which include exposition, argumentation and persuasive text, and procedural text and documents.

Meaning Vocabulary Assessment

The 2009 NAEP Reading Framework recommends a more systematic approach to vocabulary assessment than previous frameworks. Vocabulary assessment will occur in the context of a passage, that is, vocabulary items will function both as a measure of passage comprehension and as a test of readers' specific knowledge of the word's meaning as intended by the passage author. A sufficient number of vocabulary items at each grade will provide reliable and valid information about students' vocabulary knowledge.

Item Design

The 2009 NAEP Reading Framework recommends the following cognitive targets, or behaviors and skills, for items from both literary and information texts: Locate/Recall, Integrate/Interpret, and Critique/Evaluate. These cognitive targets illustrate the complex nature of the reading process, while the corresponding behaviors highlight the different behaviors elicited by different text types. To measure these cognitive skills, students will respond to both multiple-choice and constructed-response items, with varying distributions by grade level. Students in grade 4 will spend approximately half of the assessment time responding to multiple-choice items and half responding to constructed-response items. Students in grades 8 and 12 will spend a greater amount of time on constructed-response items.

Reporting Results

Results of the NAEP Reading Assessment administrations are reported in two ways: 1) as average scores for groups of students on the NAEP 0–500 scale and 2) as percentages of students who attain each of the three achievement levels, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced, according to the

definitions adopted by NAGB. NAEP scores are always reported at the aggregate level; scores are not produced for individual schools or students.

12th Grade NAEP

In May 2005, the National Assessment Governing Board adopted a policy statement regarding NAEP and 12th grade preparedness. The policy states that NAEP will pursue assessment and reporting on 12th grade student achievement as it relates to preparedness for postsecondary pursuits, such as college-credit coursework, training for employment, and entrance into the military, as measured by an assessment consistent with that purpose. This policy resulted from recommendations of the Governing Board's National Commission on NAEP 12th Grade Assessment and Reporting in March 2004. Subsequent studies and deliberations by the Board took place during 2004 and 2005.

In reading, the Board adopted minor modifications to the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework at grade 12, based on a comprehensive analysis of the Framework conducted by Achieve, Inc. for NAGB. The current version of the Reading Framework incorporates these modifications at grade 12 to enable NAEP to measure and report on preparedness for post-secondary endeavors.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
2009 NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
PROGRESS IN READING

STEERING COMMITTEE

Marilyn Adams

Chief Scientist
Soliloquy Learning Corporation
Needham, MA

Phyllis Aldrich

Gifted and Talented Coordinator
Saratoga-Warren BOCES
Saratoga Springs, NY

Francie Alexander

Vice President and Chief Academic Officer
Scholastic, Inc.
New York, NY

Patricia Alexander

Professor, College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, MD

Lance Balla

Teacher, Snohomish High School
Snohomish, WA

Wanda Brooks

Assistant Professor, Department of Education
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Baltimore, MD

Leila Christenbury

Professor, School of Education
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, VA

Mary Beth Curtis

Professor, School of Education
Director, Center for Special Education
Lesley University
Cambridge, MA

JoAnne Eresh

Senior Associate
Achieve, Inc.
Washington, DC

Alan Farstrup

Executive Director
International Reading Association
Newark, DE

Vincent Ferrandino

Executive Director
National Association of Elementary School
Principals
Alexandria, VA

Mike Frye (Retired)

Section Chief
English Language Arts and Social Studies
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, NC

Margo Gottlieb

Director, Assessment and Evaluation
Illinois Resource Center
Des Plaines, IL

Jane Hileman

Founder, 100 Book Challenge Company
King of Prussia, PA

Billie J. Orr (Retired)

President
Education Leaders Council
Washington, DC

Melvina Pritchett-Phillips

Resident Practitioner, Adolescent Literacy &
Professional Development
National Association of Secondary School Principals
Reston, VA

Sandra Stotsky

Research Scholar
Northeastern University
Boston, MA

Cynthia Teter Bowlin

Professor, Dallas County Community College
Dallas, TX

Julie Walker

Executive Director
American Association of School Librarians, a
Division of the American Library Association
Chicago, IL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Michael Kamil, Chair
Professor, School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA

Peter Afflerbach
Professor, College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, MD

Donna Alvermann
Professor, College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, GA

Amy Benedicty
Teacher, Peninsula High School
San Bruno, CA

Robert Calfee
Dean, Graduate School of Education
University of California-Riverside
Riverside, CA

Mitchell Chester
Assistant Superintendent
Ohio Department of Education
Columbus, OH

Barbara Foorman
Director
Center for Academic and Reading Skills
University of Texas-Houston
Houston, TX

Irene Gaskins
Director, Benchmark School
Media, PA

Carol Jago
Teacher, Santa Monica High School
Santa Monica, CA

Jolene Jenkins
Teacher, Mahaffey Middle School
Fort Campbell, KY

Janet Jones
Reading Resource Teacher
Berry Elementary School
Waldorf, MD

Marilyn Joyce
Teacher, Brewer High School
Brewer, ME

Michael Kibby
Professor, Department of Learning and Instruction
SUNY Buffalo
Amherst, NY

Margaret McKeown
Senior Scientist
Learning Research and Development Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA

Paula Moseley
Coordinator
Planning, Assessment and Research,
Student Testing Unit
Los Angeles Unified School District
Los Angeles, CA

Jean Osborn
Education Consultant
Champaign, IL

Charles Peters
Professor, School of Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI

Carol Santa
Director of Education
Montana Academy
Kalispell, MT

Karen Wixson
Dean, School of Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI

Junko Yokota
Professor, Reading and Language Arts
National-Louis University
Evanston, IL

Olivia Zarraluqui
Teacher, Our Lady of Lourdes Academy
Miami, FL

TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL

Patricia Gandara

Professor, School of Education
University of California at Davis
Davis, CA

Paul LaMarca

Director, Department of Assessment and Accountability
Nevada Department of Education
Carson City, NV

William Schafer

Affiliated Professor (Emeritus)
University of Maryland
College Park, MD

EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

To obtain an independent review of the draft 2009 NAEP Reading Framework, the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) commissioned a panel of prominent reading researchers and scholars to examine the draft document. After a three-month review period, the panel reported to NAGB on issues such as whether the Framework is supported by scientific research; whether the document reflects what students should know and be able to do in grades 4, 8, and 12; the appropriateness of proposed reading materials; and the clarity and organization of the draft Framework. Members of the Reading External Panel are listed below.

Dennis J. Kear, Panel Chair

Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education
Wichita State University
Wichita, KS

Ellin O. Keene

Deputy Director
Cornerstone National Literacy Initiative
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA

Katherine A. Mitchell

Director, Alabama Reading Initiative
Alabama State Department of Education
Montgomery, AL

Keith E. Stanovich

Professor, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto
Toronto, ON, Canada

Joanna P. Williams

Professor, Psychology and Education
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface by the National Assessment Governing Board	i
Executive Summary	iii
Participants in the Development of the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress in Reading.....	vi
Chapter 1: Overview of the National Assessment of Educational Progress and Its Definition of Reading.....	1
Overview of NAEP	1
Purpose of NAEP Under the NCLB Legislation	2
The Definition of Reading for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment.....	2
Factors That Influence Reading Performance	3
The Nature of Reading Behaviors	4
Definitions of Reading That Have Informed the Framework Development	4
Overview of the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment	6
Commonalities in Reading Behavior Across Text Types	6
Text Characteristics: Literary and Informational Texts	6
Structural Differences in Text	7
Purposes for Reading.....	8
Features That Distinguish Text Types.....	8
Literary Texts	8
Informational Texts	9
Percentage of Passages by Text Type and Grade	11
Vocabulary Assessment on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment	12
Assessing Students With Special Needs.....	12
Comparison of the 1992 – 2007 NAEP Reading Framework and the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework.....	13
Chapter 2: Content and Design of the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress in Reading.....	15
Texts to Be Included on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment.....	15
Literary Text	16
Informational Text	22
Characteristics of Texts Selected for Inclusion on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment	28
Passage Length	29
Selection of Literary and Informational Passages	29
Selection of Poetry	31
Selection of Noncontinuous Text and Documents	31
Vocabulary on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment	33
The Importance of Vocabulary for Reading Comprehension	33
Reasons for Assessing Vocabulary on NAEP Reading.....	34
The Measurement of Meaning Vocabulary	34
Considerations for Selecting Vocabulary to Be Assessed.....	34

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Page
Cognitive Targets for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment.....	36
Reading Processes Included in the Cognitive Target Matrices	36
Item Types on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment	41
Chapter 3: Reporting the Results of the NAEP Reading Assessment.....	43
No Child Left Behind Provisions for NAEP Reporting	43
Achievement Levels	43
Reporting NAEP Results.....	48
Reporting State NAEP Results.....	49
Reporting Trend Data	49
Background Variables	50
<i>Appendices</i>	
Appendix A. Glossary of Terms	A-1
Appendix B. Special Studies: 2009 NAEP Reading Framework	B-1
Appendix C. Sample Passages and Items.....	C-1
Appendix D. References Consulted in Developing the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework	D-1
Appendix E. NAEP Reading Project Staff, American Institutes for Research.....	E-1

list of exhibits

	Page
Exhibit 1. Distribution of Literary and Informational Passages	11
Exhibit 2. Similarities and Differences: 1992 – 2007 and 2009 NAEP Reading Frameworks	14
Exhibit 3. Literary Text Matrix.....	17
Exhibit 4. Informational Text Matrix	23
Exhibit 5. Passage Lengths for Grades 4, 8, and 12	29
Exhibit 6. Considerations for Selecting Stimulus Material for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment.....	32
Exhibit 7. Considerations for Selecting Vocabulary Items and Distractors for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment	35
Exhibit 8. Cognitive Targets for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment.....	40
Exhibit 9. Distribution of Cognitive Targets by Grade.....	41
Exhibit 10. Distribution of Time to Be Spent on Specific Item Types.....	42
Exhibit 11. Generic Achievement Levels for the National Assessment of Educational Progress	44
Exhibit 12. Preliminary Achievement Levels for the 2000 NAEP Reading Assessment.....	45
Exhibit 13. Preliminary Achievement Levels: Vocabulary	48
Exhibit 14. Years of Administration of NAEP Reading Assessments Aligned to the 1992 Framework	50

CHAPTER 1

OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS AND ITS DEFINITION OF READING

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has since 1969 been an ongoing national indicator of what American students know and can do in major academic subjects, including reading in English. NAEP reading assessments have been administered on a regular schedule to students in grades 4, 8, and 12. Under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, NAEP will assess reading in grades 4 and 8 every two years. NAEP will also measure reading in grade 12 every four years.

This *Reading Framework for the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress* is one of two documents that describe the assessment; it is intended for a general audience and presents the conceptual base and content of the assessment. The second document is the *Reading Assessment and Item Specifications for the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress* and is intended for a more technical audience, including the National Center for Education Statistics and the contractor that will develop the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. The Specifications provide the “test blueprint,” that is, information about passage selection, item development, and other aspects of test development.

OVERVIEW OF NAEP

The National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB)—the policy-making body for NAEP—has defined several parameters for the reading assessment. First, the NAEP assessment will measure reading comprehension in English. On the assessment, students will be asked to read passages written in English and to answer questions about what they have read. Second, because this is an assessment of reading comprehension and not listening comprehension, NAEP does not allow passages to be read aloud to students as a test accommodation. Third, under NAGB policy, the Framework “shall not endorse or advocate a particular pedagogical approach, ...but shall focus on important, measurable indicators of student achievement.”² Although broad implications for instruction may be inferred from the assessment, NAEP does not specify how reading should be taught, nor does it prescribe a particular curricular approach to teaching reading.

Reading passages are selected to be interesting to students nationwide, to represent high-quality literary and informational material, and to be free from bias. Students respond to both multiple-choice and constructed-response items. In total, the NAEP assessments at grades 4, 8, and 12 are extensive enough to ensure that results can be reported validly, but no single student participates in the entire assessment. Instead, each student reads approximately two passages and responds to questions about what he or she has read.

²National Assessment Governing Board. (May, 2002). *National Assessment Governing Board Policy on Framework Development*. Washington, DC: Author.

NAEP assessments are administered to random samples of students designed to be representative of the nation, different regions of the country, states, and large urban districts. As discussed in Chapter 3, NAEP results are reported for groups of students; no data are reported for individual students. Since 1992, states have been able to obtain state-level data on students' reading achievement. In 2002 and 2003, large urban school districts were able to obtain data about their students' reading achievement. Results are reported in documents such as the *NAEP Reading Highlights* and the *NAEP Reading Report Cards* that are issued following each administration of the reading assessment; through special, focused reports; and through electronic means.

Data are also collected that allow comparison of students' reading achievement over long periods of time, in a separate Long-Term Trend NAEP. These assessments—at the national level only—have been administered in the same form since 1971 and provide the only available measure of extended long-term trends in reading achievement.

Purpose of NAEP Under the NCLB Legislation

The 2009 NAEP Reading Framework is consistent with current *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) legislation. The NAEP legislation, as amended under NCLB and the later National Assessment of Educational Progress Reauthorization Act (NAEPRA) of 2002, specifies that NAEP's purpose is "to provide, in a timely manner, a fair and accurate measurement of student academic achievement and reporting of trends in such achievement in reading, mathematics, and other subjects[s]..." (section 303(b)(1), National Assessment of Educational Progress Reauthorization Act, P.L. 107-279). The NAEP reading data will measure national, regional, and subgroup trends in reading achievement but will not target the performance of individual students or schools. In further accordance with NCLB, the NAEP Reading Assessment will be administered every two years at grades 4 and 8, and the resulting data will be widely reported in a timely fashion. Finally, NAEPRA specifies that although the public will have full access to NAEP results and released test questions, NAEP will not seek to influence the curriculum or assessments of any state.

The Definition of Reading for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment

The recommended 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment is guided by a definition of reading that reflects scientific research, draws on multiple sources, and conceptualizes reading as a dynamic cognitive process. This definition applies to the assessment of reading achievement on NAEP. The definition states:

Reading is an active and complex process that involves

- understanding written text;
- developing and interpreting meaning; and
- using meaning as appropriate to type of text, purpose, and situation.

Terms used in the definition can be further explained as follows:

Understanding written text—Readers attend to ideas and content in a text by locating and recalling information and by making inferences needed for literal comprehension of the text. In doing so, readers draw on their fundamental skills for decoding printed words and accessing their vocabulary knowledge.

Developing and interpreting meaning—Readers integrate the sense they have made of the text with their knowledge of other texts and with their outside experience. They use increasingly more complex inferencing skills to comprehend information implied by a text. As appropriate, readers revise their sense of the text as they encounter additional information or ideas.

Using meaning—Readers draw on the ideas and information they have acquired from text to meet a particular purpose or situational need. The “use” of text may be as straightforward as knowing the time when a train will leave a particular station or may involve more complex behaviors such as analyzing how an author developed a character’s motivation or evaluating the quality of evidence presented in an argument.

Text—As used in the assessment, the term reflects the breadth of components in typical reading materials. Thus, text on the assessment will include literary and informational passages and may contain noncontinuous print material such as charts. Texts selected for inclusion on the assessment represent practical, academic, and other contexts and are drawn from grade-appropriate sources spanning the content areas.

Purpose—Students’ purpose for reading the passages presented on NAEP is determined by the assessment context; thus, the influence of purpose on readers’ comprehension is somewhat limited.

Situation—The situation for reading often determines the way that readers prepare for and approach their task. They consider why they are reading (e.g., to study, to relax), how much they know about the topic, and other concerns that shape the time they will spend reading.

Factors That Influence Reading Performance

Factors related to the text being read and to readers’ backgrounds and experiences influence reading performance. For example, understanding the vocabulary, concepts, and structural elements of the text contributes to the readers’ successful comprehension. Comprehension is also affected by readers’ background knowledge and by the context of the reading experience. The background knowledge that students bring to the NAEP Reading Assessment will differ widely. To accommodate these differences, passages will span diverse areas and topics and will be as engaging as possible to the full range of students at grades 4, 8, and 12.

The purpose for reading also influences performance. In the case of the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment, purpose is determined by the assessment context; thus, the influence of purpose on readers’ comprehension is somewhat limited. For this reason, the definition of reading presented earlier should be considered as a guide for the NAEP Reading Assessment, not as an inclusive definition of reading. The definition pertains to how NAEP defines reading for the purpose of this assessment at grades 4, 8, and 12. It does not address the issue of how students should be taught to read.

Text comprehension is influenced by readers’ ability to apply the essential components of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics knowledge, fluency, and understanding of word meanings or vocabulary. Without these foundational skills, comprehension will not occur. By grade 4, when the NAEP Reading Assessment is first administered, students should have a well-developed

understanding of how sounds are represented alphabetically and should have had sufficient practice in reading to achieve fluency with different kinds of texts.³ Because NAEP tests at grades 4, 8, and 12, the assessment focuses on students' reading comprehension, not their foundational skills related to alphabetic knowledge.⁴

As discussed further in Chapter 2, the association between vocabulary knowledge and comprehension is strong; students who know the meanings of many words and who also can use the context of what they read to figure out the meanings of unfamiliar words are better comprehenders than those who lack these attributes.⁵ In the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment, vocabulary will be assessed systematically, through carefully developed items that measure students' ability to derive the meanings of words within the context of the passages they read.

The Nature of Reading Behaviors

Reading is an active and complex process that involves multiple different behaviors. Readers often begin by forming an overview of text and then search for the information to which they must pay particular attention. Following this initial overview, readers progress with different levels of interaction with text, including interpreting and evaluating what they read. By drawing on previous reading experiences and prior knowledge, they form hypotheses about what the text will communicate and revise their initial ideas and their knowledge base as their reading continues. Readers continuously acquire new understandings and integrate these into their ongoing process of building comprehension. Good readers monitor their understanding of text, recognize when text is not making sense, and employ a range of strategies to enhance their comprehension. Good readers also evaluate the qualities of text, and these evaluations can affect whether a text is remembered or has an impact on readers' knowledge, attitudes, or behaviors.⁶ Depending on the situation and purpose for reading, good readers can use the ideas and information they acquire from text, for example, to expand their thinking about a topic, to perform a specific task, or to draw conclusions or make generalizations about what they have read.

Definitions of Reading That Have Informed the Framework Development

The definition of reading for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment is derived from several sources and is grounded in scientific research on reading. Among the sources are the Federal *No Child Left Behind* legislation, several important research reports on reading, and the definitions of reading that guide the development of international reading tests. Each source has contributed important ideas to the definition of reading used for the NAEP Reading Assessment.

³National Research Council. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: Author.

⁴NAEP has investigated the relationship between oral fluency and reading comprehension in two special studies, in 1992 and 2002.

⁵National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

⁶Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, P. (1995). *Verbal protocol analysis: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; Ruddell, R.B., & Unrau, N.J. (1994). Reading as a meaning-construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 996–1056). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

The *No Child Left Behind* legislation posits that reading has five essential components: phonemic awareness, knowledge of phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The NAEP Reading Assessment, which is first administered at grade 4, measures students' meaning vocabulary and comprehension. To demonstrate comprehension of what they read, students utilize their phonemic awareness and knowledge of phonics. Their ability to read the reading passages and test questions with minimal effort reflects their fluency. Students draw on their vocabulary knowledge throughout the assessment, and specific items ask about carefully selected target words in each reading passage.

The **National Reading Panel (NRP)**,⁷ a congressionally mandated commission, conducted an extensive, evidence-based study of research literature on reading acquisition, reading growth, and other relevant topics. The NRP report was an important foundation for the *No Child Left Behind* legislation, highlighting the importance of alphabetics (phonemic awareness and phonics), fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Three important definitions of reading influenced the development of the definition of reading for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. The first comes from *Reading for Understanding: Toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension*,⁸ frequently referred to as the **RAND Report**. This report was prepared by the Rand Reading Study Group, under the auspices of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education. Guiding the work of the Study Group was the following definition of reading:

Reading comprehension [is] the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language. It consists of three elements: the reader, the text, and the activity or purpose for reading. (p. 11)

The second important definition was the foundation for item development for the **Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS)**.⁹ PIRLS was first administered to 9-year-old students in 35 countries in 2001. PIRLS defines reading literacy as

the ability to understand and use those written forms required by society and/or valued by the individual. Young readers can construct meaning from a variety of texts. They read to learn, to participate in communities of readers, and for enjoyment. (p. 3)

The **Programme for Student Assessment (PISA)**¹⁰ represents an international collaborative effort to assess what 15-year-old students know and can do in reading, mathematics, and science. PISA defines reading literacy as

⁷National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel*. Washington, DC: Author.

⁸RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

⁹Campbell, J.R., Kelly, D.L., Mullis, I.V.S., Martin, M.O., & Sainsbury, M. (2001, March). *Framework and specifications for PIRLS Assessment 2001*. Chestnut Hill, MA: PIRLS International Study Center, Lynch School of Education, Boston College.

¹⁰Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2000). *Measuring student knowledge and skill: The PISA 2000 assessment of reading, mathematical and scientific literacy*. Paris: Author.

understanding, using, and reflecting on written texts, in order to achieve one's goals, to develop one's knowledge and potential, and to participate in society. (p. 18)

The *RAND Report*, PIRLS, and PISA offer support to the definition for reading advocated in the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework. All three stress that reading is an active, complex, and multidimensional process that is undertaken for many different purposes.

OVERVIEW OF THE 2009 NAEP READING ASSESSMENT

The 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will include two distinct types of text at grades 4, 8, and 12. Doing so will allow the development of items that measure students' comprehension of the different kinds of text they encounter in their school and out-of-school reading experiences. The reasons for including literary and informational text are presented next, followed by explanations of the characteristics of each text type that will be included on the assessment. The 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will also include items that assess students' ability to apply their knowledge of vocabulary as an aid in their comprehension process.

Neither computer-based electronic text nor drama will be included on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. NAEP is committed to presenting authentic texts as stimulus material on its reading assessments, and it is difficult to include these kinds of text in ways that reflect how students actually read them in school and out of school. The paper-and-pencil format that is most commonly used in NAEP reading assessments precludes students' navigating through different components of text as they do when they read electronic text. Further, dramatic selections are usually too long to fit within the word-length parameters for passages to be included on the assessment.

NAEP assesses reading skills that students use in all subject areas and in their out-of-school and recreational reading. By design, many NAEP passages require interpretive and critical skills that are usually taught as part of the English curriculum. However, NAEP is an assessment of varied reading skills, not a comprehensive assessment of literary study. The development of the broad range of skills that the nation's students need to read successfully in both literary and informational texts is the responsibility of teachers across the curriculum, as well as of parents and the community.

Commonalities in Reading Behavior Across Text Types

The Framework recognizes that even though there are substantial differences in reading behaviors for different text types, there are also great similarities. Regardless of the type of text, the reader must access the words in the text, recognize and use the structure of the text, make sense of sentences and paragraphs, and comprehend what has been read. Equally, vocabulary is a critical element in comprehending any kind of text.

Text Characteristics: Literary and Informational Texts

Research on the nature of text and on reading processes has suggested that the characteristics of literary and informational text differ dramatically. For the most part, the research literature suggests that readers attend to different aspects of text as they seek to comprehend different types of

text.¹¹ Additionally, the PIRLS report shows that students in the United States scored higher on the Literary Subscale (at 550) than on the Informational Subscale (at 533), further substantiating the difference in the strategies needed for the two text types.¹² An earlier international study reported that patterns of student responses to literature were influenced by the nature of the selections they were given to read. Different literary samples elicited different responses from students, with some consistency across cultures and school systems.¹³ Drawing on this extensive research base, the 2009 Reading Framework includes two major types of text: literary and informational. Well-crafted nonfiction work with strong literary characteristics will be classified as literary text, and documents such as tables, graphs, or charts will be included in the informational category.

Literary and informational texts for the NAEP Reading Assessment are separated for two primary reasons: the structural differences that mark the text types and the purposes for which different texts are read. Exhibits 3 and 4 in Chapter 2 present details about the kinds of literary and informational texts to be included on the NAEP Reading Assessment and about the features of these texts for which items will be written.

Structural Differences in Text

Literary and informational texts are marked by distinct structural characteristics that readers rely on as they seek to understand what they read.¹⁴ For example, research on literary text¹⁵ has pointed out that stories and novels are characterized by a coherent text structure known as “story grammars.” Research on informational or expository text¹⁶ has indicated that such texts possess distinct organizational patterns, such as sequence or comparison and contrast, designed to help readers organize their emerging sense of what the text is communicating. These structures are distinct from the story grammars. The nature of texts affects comprehension, and different text types must be read in different ways.¹⁷ Good readers adjust their reading behaviors to accommodate the kinds of text they are reading.

¹¹Pearson, P.D., & Camperell, K. (1994). Comprehension of text structures. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes at reading* (4th ed., pp. 448–468). Newark, DE: International Reading Association; Pressley, M. (2000). What should comprehension instruction be the instruction of? In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 545–586). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum; Purves, A.C. (1973). *Literature education in ten countries*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell and New York: John Wiley & Sons.

¹²Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2002), *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

¹³ Purves, A.C. (1973). *Literature education in ten countries*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell and New York: John Wiley & Sons.

¹⁴Goldman, S., & Rakestraw, J. (2000). Structural aspects of constructing meaning from text. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 311–335). New York: Longman.

¹⁵Graesser, A., Golding, J.M., & Long, D.L. (1991). Narrative representation and comprehension. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 171–205). White Plains, NY: Longman.

¹⁶Kobayashi, M. (2002). Method effects on reading comprehension test performance: Text organization and response format. *Language Testing*, 19, 193–220; Weaver, C.A., III, & Kintsch, W. (1991). Expository text. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 230–245). White Plains, NY: Longman.

¹⁷Pearson & Camperell (1994), *Op. cit.*

Purposes for Reading

A second reason for separating text types is that readers often read literary and informational texts for different purposes. The definition of reading that guides the NAEP Reading Assessment specifically states that readers read for different purposes, which are often reflected in their selection of literary or informational texts. The purpose set for reading a text often determines how that text is read. Literary texts, such as stories, drama, essays, or poetry, are frequently read for pleasure or for new perspectives on time, place, human nature, or feelings; they are often read from beginning to end. The ultimate utility of informational text is determined by how well it conveys information or ideas. These differences in reading purpose are, of course, permeable. For example, well-crafted informational text is often read for appreciation and enjoyment, in addition for obtaining the information that the text can provide.

Features That Distinguish Text Types

Several features distinguish literary and informational texts. Skilled writers understand that different kinds of text need different structural patterns, and good readers are able to use the specific text features as aids in comprehension.

Literary Texts

The 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will present reading passages (i.e., stimulus material) drawn from three categories of literary text:

- Fiction
- Literary nonfiction, such as essays, speeches, and autobiographies or biographies
- Poetry

The structural patterns of **fiction**—short stories and novels—have been studied extensively. Although many researchers have suggested different ways to name the elements of a story,¹⁸ there is general agreement that a story consists of the following components: the setting or settings; a simple or complex plot consisting of a series of episodes and delineating a problem to be solved; the problem or conflict, which requires characters to change, revise plans, or face challenges as they move toward resolution; and a reaction that expresses the protagonist’s feelings about his or her goal attainment or relates to the broader consequences of the conclusion of the story. This structure is often referred to as a “story grammar.” Characters populate each story, in major or minor roles; themes or major ideas are stated either implicitly or explicitly.

Works of **literary nonfiction** such as biographies, essays, and speeches employ distinct, varied structural patterns and literary features to reflect their purpose and audience. These works may not only present information and ideas but also employ distinctly literary elements and devices to communicate their message and to make their content more accessible to readers. Biographies and autobiographies, for example, usually follow a structure that in many ways mirrors the story structure of fictional works and they may employ literary devices, but they also present information. Literary essays and speeches may be structured differently but also draw on literary devices. The Gettysburg

¹⁸Stein, N.L., & Glenn, C.G. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In R.O. Freedle (Ed.), *New directions in discourse processing* (pp. 53–120). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Address, for example, might be viewed simply as an argumentative text, as a dedication or a eulogy, but it is more appropriately viewed as a sophisticated literary text. Readers approach texts of this type not only to gain enjoyment and information but also to learn and to appreciate the specific craft behind authors' choices of words, phrases, and structural elements.

Like fiction and literary nonfiction, **poetry** demonstrates specific text characteristics; but these characteristics are different from those found in continuous prose.¹⁹ Some poetry possesses very rhythmic or metrical patterns, and some is written as "free verse" without a regular line pattern. Poetry is a highly imaginative form of communication, in that poets try to compress their thoughts in fewer words than would be used in ordinary discourse or in prose.²⁰ Because the language is often brief and concise, poems employ picturesque and evocative words, as well as similes, metaphors, personification, imagery, and other devices that convey the symbolic nature of ideas, emotions, and actions being expressed. Poetry often involves a high level of abstraction in language and ideas and requires specific critical thinking skills not found in other types of literary works. For these reasons, it is important that NAEP include poetry on the assessment at grades 4, 8, and 12.

Informational Texts

For the NAEP Reading Assessment, informational texts will be classified into three broad categories:

- Exposition
- Argumentation and persuasive text
- Procedural text and documents

Informational text, specifically exposition, argumentation, and persuasive text, does not have a single, identifiable structure. Rather, different types of informational text exhibit distinct structural features. The most common structural patterns for continuous expository, argumentative, and persuasive text can be summarized as follows:²¹

Description—A descriptive text structure presents a topic with attributes, specifics, or setting information that describes that topic.

Sequence—Ideas are grouped on the basis of order or time.

Causation—The text presents causal or cause and effect relationships between the ideas presented in the text.

¹⁹Hanauer, D.I. (in press). What we know about reading poetry: Theoretical positions and empirical research. In G. Steen & D. Schram (Eds.), *The psychology and sociology of literary text*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.

²⁰Frye, N. (1964). *The educated imagination*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

²¹Bovair, S., & Kieras, D.E. (1991). Toward a model of acquiring procedures. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 206–229). White Plains, NY: Longman; Meyer, B.F.S. (1975). *The organization of prose and its effects on memory*. New York: Elsevier; Goldman & Rakestraw (2000), *Op cit.*; Kobayaski (2002), *Op. cit.*; Stein & Glenn, *Op. cit.*

Problem/Solution—The main ideas are organized into two parts: a problem and a subsequent solution that responds to the problem or a question and an answer that responds to the question.

Comparison—Ideas are related to one another on the basis of similarities and differences. The text presents ideas that are organized to compare, to contrast, or to provide an alternative perspective.

Expository text, argumentation, and persuasive text often contain pictures, charts, tables, and other graphic elements that augment text and contribute to its meaning. Ancillary aids such as headings, bolded text, or bulleted lists emphasize specific components of the text to reinforce authors' messages. Literary texts differ in that illustrations, pictures, or other nonprint elements, when present, may aid readers in understanding the text but are not usually critical for comprehension.

The first kind of informational text on the NAEP Reading Assessment, **exposition**, presents information, provides explanations and definitions, and compares and contrasts. Textbooks, news stories, and informational trade books are examples of expository text. Texts classified as argumentation or persuasive text accomplish many of these same goals but can be distinguished by their particular purpose and by the features that authors select to accomplish their goals for writing.

The second category of informational text includes **argumentation** and **persuasive** text.²² Argumentation seeks to influence through appeals that direct readers to specific goals or try to win them to specific beliefs. Authors of persuasive writing must establish their credibility and authority if their writing is to be successful. Examples of persuasive text are political speeches, editorials, and advertisements.

The third type of informational text is often categorized as **procedural text** or **documents**.²³ Procedural texts convey information in the form of directions for accomplishing a task. A distinguishing characteristic of such text is that it is composed of discrete steps to be performed in a strict sequence, with an implicit end product or goal. After reading the text, the reader should be able to reach a goal or complete a product. Examples include, but are not limited to, manuals and product support materials, directions for art activities and hobbies, and so forth. Procedural texts may include information arranged in graphs, charts, or maps, in addition to prose.

Document texts in a variety of forms will also be represented on the NAEP Reading Assessment. Documents include graphical representations, often as multimedia elements that require readers to draw on information presented as short continuous prose and also as columns, matrices, or other formats. Document structures can be simple or complex, presenting information in a straightforward way, as in a simple list or pie graph with clearly delineated elements, or embedding

²² Driver, R., Newton, P., & Osborne, J. (2000). Establishing the norms of scientific argumentation in classrooms. *Science Education*, 84 (3), 287-312; Osborne, J. F. (2002). Science without literacy: A ship without a sail? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 3 (2), 203-215; Wineburg, S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28, 495-519.

²³ Kirsch, I.S., & Mosenthal, P.B. (1990). Exploring document literacy: Variables underlying the performance of young adults. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25, 5-30; Mosenthal, P.B. (1996). Understanding the strategies of document literacy and their conditions of use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88, 314-332; Mosenthal, P.B. (1998). Defining prose task characteristics for use in computer-adaptive testing and instruction. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35, 269-307.

or “nesting” information within the document’s structure. Documents are used frequently in schools and in society. Textbooks often include graphs, tables, and illustrations to accompany and expand on traditional text. Forms are also common, to make application or provide information, as are procedural texts, including manuals and directions. Documents have implicit procedures embedded within them. Often, readers must “cycle” through the document or the set of procedures to gain needed information or to answer specific questions. For example, an application suggests the manner in which the application is to be completed.

Informational text will be included at all levels of the NAEP Reading Assessment. Documents that are embedded in text will be used at grades 4 and 8; stand-alone documents that provide enough information to support item development may be used at grade 12. Chapter 2 describes the criteria for evaluating examples and noncontinuous text and documents for inclusion on the NAEP Reading Assessment.

Percentage of Passages by Text Type and Grade

Exhibit 1 shows the recommended distribution of literary and informational passages on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. The percentage listed for Literary Texts encompasses all three categories of text: fiction, literary nonfiction, and poetry. The percentage for Informational Text likewise includes Exposition, Argumentation and Persuasive Texts, and Procedural Texts and Documents. The *Specifications for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment* will detail how these percentages are to be distributed across grades 4, 8, and 12.

The distribution reflects the kinds of texts that students read across the curriculum as they progress through elementary, middle, and high school.²⁴ It further reflects the distribution of text types on many state reading tests that are designed to reflect what students read across the curriculum.

EXHIBIT 1 Distribution of Literary and Informational Passages

Grade	Literary	Informational
4	50%	50%
8	45%	55%
12	30%	70%

Mixed Texts

Many of the texts that convey information have been termed “mixed texts.”²⁵ These texts are common in classroom reading, as students are introduced to “informational texts” as a genre distinct

²⁴Alexander, P.A., & Jetton, T.L. (2000). Learning from text: A multidimensional and developmental perspective. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 285–310). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

²⁵Alexander & Jetton (2000), *Op. cit.*

from the “stories” that are most common in lower grades.²⁶ Examples include historical or scientific accounts presented in quasi-narrative form used to communicate information. Their literary qualities (for example, literary elements and devices) will determine their classification as Literary or Informational for the NAEP Reading Assessment.

Multiple Texts

A common task for readers at all grades is integrating information across a set of texts. It is often the case that readers have multiple questions for which they need or want answers. A single text may answer some questions incompletely. Or a single text might contain answers for only a portion of the questions a reader has. The solution is to use other texts to find the additional information. In consulting multiple texts, readers must engage in all the processes to read individual texts, but they must also engage in other processes to compare those texts on multiple dimensions and decide on the accuracy, bias, and credibility of the multiple texts. These skills need to be assessed to see how well students can read and comprehend texts that contain different information, reach different conclusions about the same material, or have different levels of credibility. Continuing the use of intertextual passage sets as part of the NAEP Reading Assessment is recommended to approximate the authentic task of reading and comparing multiple texts.

Vocabulary Assessment on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment

The National Assessment Governing Board has endorsed the idea of measuring students’ vocabulary as part of the NAEP Reading Assessment and supports an approach that assesses vocabulary in the context of the reading passages. The goal of vocabulary assessment will be the measurement of students’ *meaning vocabulary*, which can be defined as follows:

Meaning vocabulary is the application of one’s understanding of word meanings to passage comprehension.

The proposed method of assessing meaning vocabulary on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment assumes that the ability to gain a sense of the meaning of all or most words in a passage—especially those words that convey important information linked to central ideas of the passage—is a necessary condition for comprehension. The NAEP meaning vocabulary items will target words already present in the NAEP reading comprehension passages. Candidate words must convey important meaning linked to the central idea(s) of the passage; comprehension would likely be disrupted if the meaning of the test word is not known. It is anticipated that each passage will have approximately two vocabulary items. The vocabulary assessment is explained in detail in Chapter 2.

Assessing Students With Special Needs

The NAEP Reading Assessment is designed to measure the academic achievement of all test takers at a given grade level; hence, students with disabilities and English language learners are included in the assessment sample. The assessment is administered to English language learners and students with disabilities who, based on inclusion criteria provided by NAEP, are capable of

²⁶Duke, N.K. (2000). 3.6 minutes per day: The scarcity of information texts in first grade. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35, 202–224; Leu, D.J., Jr., & Kinzer, C.K. (2000). The convergence of literacy instruction with networked technologies for information and communication. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35, 108–127.

participating. Special care is taken in designing and development the assessment to ensure that these students, along with all others, find the passages and items accessible. For example, passages that might require specific background or experiential knowledge for comprehension are not included in the assessment. Items are written in plain language, without jargon or complex syntactical structures.

Some students may need accommodations to be able to participate in the NAEP Reading Assessment. NAEP attempts to provide accommodations to students that match the way in which they are tested in school, as long as those accommodations do not alter the construct being measured. For example, large-print versions are made available for students with visual impairments; students with disabilities may be given one-on-one or small-group testing situations or extended time to complete the assessment. Some students, for example, those who are learning English, may have the test directions (but not the passages or items) read orally to them. Other students may benefit from having a trained aide transcribe dictated responses for them. Accommodations may be provided in combination, for example, extended testing time and individual administration of the assessment.

Comparison of the 1992 – 2007 NAEP Reading Framework and the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework

The Framework for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment replaces a Framework that was first developed for the 1992 assessment. The previous Framework was refined during its use to reflect more clearly the goal of precisely measuring students' reading skills and strategies and was reissued for the 2003 assessment. The 2009 Framework honors many aspects of the previous Framework but also introduces some changes that can lead to better measurement and more precise reporting of assessment results. Important changes featured in the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework follow:

- An assessment design based on current scientific reading research
- Consistency with the *No Child Left Behind* legislation
- Use of international reading assessments to inform the NAEP Framework
- A more focused measurement of vocabulary
- Measurement of reading behaviors (cognitive targets) in a more objective manner
- Distinction of cognitive targets relevant to literary and informational text
- Use of expert judgment, augmented by readability formulas, for passage selection
- Testing of poetry at grade 4, in addition to grades 8 and 12
- A special study of vocabulary to inform development of the 2009 assessment

Key similarities and differences between the two Frameworks are presented in Exhibit 2. Chapter 2 explains the proposed content and design of the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. The content and cognitive targets, as operationalized to reflect the definition of reading presented earlier in Chapter 1, will yield passages and items that reflect the complex interaction of the reader, the text, and the context of the assessment.

EXHIBIT 2

Similarities and Differences: 1992 – 2007 and 2009 NAEP Reading Frameworks

	Previous Reading Framework		2009 NAEP Reading Framework		
CONTENT	Content of Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none">LiteraryInformationalDocument	Contexts for Reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none">For literary experienceFor informationTo perform a task	Literary Text <ul style="list-style-type: none">FictionLiterary NonfictionPoetry	Informational Text <ul style="list-style-type: none">ExpositionArgumentation and Persuasive TextProcedural Text and Documents	
COGNITIVE PROCESSES	Stances/Aspects of Reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Forming a general understandingDeveloping interpretationMaking reader/text connectionsExamining content and structure		Cognitive Targets, Distinguished by Text Type		
			Locate/Recall	Integrate/Interpret	Critique/Evaluate
VOCABULARY	Vocabulary as a “target” of item development, with no information reported on students’ use of vocabulary knowledge in comprehending what they read		Systematic approach to vocabulary assessment, with potential for a vocabulary subscore		
POETRY	Poetry included as stimulus material at grades 8 and 12		Poetry included as stimulus material at all grades		
PASSAGE SOURCE	Use of intact, authentic stimulus material		Use of authentic stimulus material, plus some flexibility in excerpting stimulus material		
PASSAGE LENGTH	Grade 4: 250–800 Grade 8: 400–1,000 Grade 12: 500–1,500		Grade 4: 200–800 Grade 8: 400–1,000 Grade 12: 500–1,500		
PASSAGE SELECTION	Expert judgment as criterion for passage selection		Expert judgment and use of at least two research-based readability formulas for passage selection		
ITEM TYPE	Multiple-choice and constructed-response items included at all grades		Multiple-choice and constructed-response items included at all grades		

CHAPTER 2

CONTENT AND DESIGN OF THE 2009 NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS IN READING

This chapter presents the content and design of the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. Key sections of the chapter follow:

- Texts to Be Included on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment
- Characteristics of Texts Selected for Inclusion on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment
 - Literary Text
 - Informational Text
- Vocabulary on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment
- Cognitive Targets for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment
- Item Types on the NAEP Reading Assessment

TEXTS TO BE INCLUDED ON THE 2009 NAEP READING ASSESSMENT

The 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress in Reading will assess students' comprehension of literary and informational passages. Within these passages, vocabulary will also be assessed. Chapter 1 presented the rationale for including literary and informational text on the NAEP Reading Assessment, and this chapter begins by describing the text structures and features and aspects of author's craft about which items will be developed.

The matrices in Exhibits 3 and 4 show the kinds of literary and informational texts that will be sampled at grades 4, 8, and 12, along with the text structures and literary devices or elements of author's craft about which items may be developed.

The matrices are designed to show the following aspects of literary and informational text:

- Genres and types of text to be assessed
- Text structures and features about which items may be asked
- Aspects of author's craft about which items may be asked

Types of text refers to the idealized norms of a genre,²⁷ not the source of the stimulus material per se.

Text structures and features define the organization and elements within the text. The organization and elements refer to the ways ideas are arranged and are connected to one another. Features refer to visual and structural elements that support and enhance the reader's ability to understand the text.

²⁷Fludernik, M. (2000). Genres, text types, or discourse modes? Narrative modalities and generic categorization. *Style*, 34(2), 274–292.

Author’s craft pertains to the specific techniques that an author chooses to relay an intended message.

The entries listed within each cell of the matrices should be construed as neither definitive nor inclusive of all text structures and features or techniques of author’s craft. However, it is important to delineate the type of text to be used in reading comprehension tests.²⁸ Understanding the range of text types for inclusion in the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment illuminates the complex nature of reading comprehension passages and the accompanying questions. Items will assess students’ application of knowledge about text types, text features and structures, and author’s craft, not their recognition of specific terminology in isolation. The designation of entries in the matrices by grade level reflects the levels at which these components of text are presented in state English language arts standards. They have further been confirmed by experienced teachers and teacher educators.

LITERARY TEXT

The literary text matrix shown in Exhibit 3 outlines the common forms of continuous prose and poetry that may be included on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment at grades 4, 8, and 12. The matrix is divided into three sections—fiction, literary nonfiction, and poetry—and provides information on the aspects of text about which items will be developed. Successively more complex text forms are added at each level of the matrix.²⁹

²⁸Kobayashi (2002). *Op. cit.*; Wixson, K.K., & Peters, C. W. (1987). Comprehension assessment: Implementing an interactive view of reading. *American Psychologist*, 23, 333–356.

²⁹Detailed explication of the literary and informational text matrices will be provided in the *Specifications for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment*.

EXHIBIT 3

Literary Text Matrix: Fiction

		Genre/Type of Text	Text Structures and Features	Author's Craft
FICTION	GRADE 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adventure Stories Historical Fiction Contemporary Realistic Fiction Folktales Legends Fables Tall Tales Myths Fantasy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Themes Morals Lessons <p>Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plot—Sequence of Events Conflict Solution Resolution <p>Elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting Characterization 	<p>Diction and Word Choice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dialogue Exaggeration Figurative Language <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Symbolism — Simile and Metaphor
	GRADE 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Science Fiction <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4</p>	<p>Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parallel Plots Circular Plots <p>Elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point of View Contradictions Internal vs. External Conflict <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mood Imagery Flashback Foreshadowing Personification <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4</p>
	GRADE 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satire Parody Allegory Monologue <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8</p>	<p>Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differentiation of Plot Structures for Different Purposes and Audiences <p>Elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interior Monologue Unreliable Narrators Multiple Points of View <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dramatic Irony Character Foils Comic Relief Unconventional Use of Language <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8</p>

The entries listed within each cell of the matrices should be construed as neither definitive nor inclusive of all text structures and features or techniques of author's craft.

Fiction

As suggested in the matrix, students in elementary and middle schools read many different kinds of stories for enrichment and enjoyment. These texts are representative of the developing conceptual understandings formed by students during this period. At grades 8 and 12, more complex genres of fiction are common, including satires, parodies, science fiction, and allegories. For purposes of the NAEP Reading Assessment, these genres may be either intact passages or passages excerpted from longer genres such as novels. Material that is excerpted from longer pieces will be carefully analyzed to ensure that it has the structural integrity and cohesion necessary to sustain item development.

The matrix also shows the aspects of text structures and features and author's craft that may be assessed. These components, as well as the purposes for reading, become increasingly complex and sophisticated in the texts that students read as they move through the elementary, middle, and high school grades. For example, themes may be more abstract; plots may involve internal or external conflicts; characterization may develop with antagonists, protagonists, and narrators with motives, beliefs, traits, and attitudes that are intertwined; the theme and setting may be more integral to each other; and the plot may consist of a series of rising and falling actions within episodes and the point of view or vantage point chosen by the author to reveal the ideas, characters, or actions in the text becomes more sophisticated, often including a shifting point of view or multiple points of view.

Authors select from a range of stylistic devices to enhance their presentation of fictional text. In the matrix, these are referred to as author's craft. At grade 4, author's craft includes figurative language such as symbolism, simile, metaphor, and diction and word choice, dialogue, and exaggeration. More abstract elements are part of author's craft at grade 8, such as flashback and imagery, in addition to more complex applications of author's craft listed for grade 4. Fictional passages for grade 12 are complex and include the following literary devices: dramatic irony, character foils, comic relief, and unconventional use of language in addition to the devices under author's craft at grades 4 and 8.

EXHIBIT 3 (Continued)

Literary Text Matrix: Literary Nonfiction

		Genre/Type of Text	Text Structures and Features	Author's Craft
LITERARY NONFICTION	GRADE 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personal Essay Autobiographical and Biographical Sketches 	Organization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description Cause and Effect Comparison Chronology Elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point of View Themes or Central Ideas Supporting Ideas Logical Connections Transitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diction and Word Choice Use of Exposition, Action, or Dialogue to Introduce Characters Exaggeration Figurative Language <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Symbolism — Simile and Metaphor
	GRADE 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character Sketch Memoir Speech Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4	 Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voice Tone Imagery Metaphoric Language Irony Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4
	GRADE 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classical Essay Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8	 Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denotation Connotation Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8

The entries listed within each cell of the matrices should be construed as neither definitive nor inclusive of all text structures and features or techniques of author's craft.

Literary Nonfiction

The second type of literary text is literary nonfiction; it may include elements of narration and exposition and is often referred to as “mixed text.”³⁰ Literary nonfiction is an example of mixed text because it uses literary techniques usually associated with fiction or poetry but also presents information or factual material. Stylistically, it frequently blends literary elements and devices with factual information with the dual purpose of informing and offering reading satisfaction. The text types for literary nonfiction at grade 4 include autobiographical and biographical sketches, and personal essays. At grade 8, additional forms of literary nonfiction are character sketches, memoirs, and speeches. Classical essays are introduced as literary nonfiction at grade 12. Unlike texts that can be categorized as informational because of their sequential, chronological, or causal structure, literary nonfiction uses a story-like structure. Classical essays may interweave personal examples and ideas with factual information to attain their purpose of explaining, presenting a perspective, or describing a situation or event.

³⁰Alexander & Jetton (2000), *Op. cit.*

The literary nonfiction selected for inclusion on NAEP will conform to the highest standards of literary quality. Literary nonfiction combines structures from both literary and informational texts. At grade 4, text structures and features in literary nonfiction include description, cause and effect, comparison, chronology, point of view, themes and central ideas, and supporting ideas. At grades 8 and 12, increasingly complex structures listed above are noted in literary nonfiction. Text features such as logical connective devices and transitional devices are listed in the matrix at grade 4.

A range of literary devices and techniques termed author's craft are present in literary nonfiction. Examples of author's craft at grade 4 include diction and word choice, various ways to introduce characters, exaggeration, and figurative language. At grade 8, increasingly complex techniques are listed for author's craft: voice, tone, imagery, metaphoric language, and irony. Denotation and connotation are listed at grade 12 for author's craft. Grades 8 and 12 will include more complex forms of the text structures and features, and author's craft listed at grade 4.

EXHIBIT 3 (Continued)

Literary Text Matrix: Poetry

		Genre/Type of Text	Text Structures and Features	Author's Craft
POETRY	GRADE 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrative Poem Lyrical Poem Humorous Poem Free Verse 	Organization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verse Stanza Text Features <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repetition Omission Dialogue Line Organization Patterns Elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rhyme Scheme Rhythm Mood Themes and Intent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diction and Word Choice (including the decision to omit words that may leave the reader with much to infer) Choice of Different Forms of Poetry to Accomplish Different Purposes Exaggeration Use of Imagery to Provide Detail Figurative Language <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Simile — Metaphor — Imagery — Alliteration — Onomatopoeia
	GRADE 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ode Song (including ballad) Epic Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4	Elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract Theme Rhythm Patterns Point of View Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figurative Language <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Symbolism — Personification Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4
	GRADE 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sonnet Elegy Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8	Elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complex Themes Multiple Points of View Interior Monologue Soliloquy Iambic Pentameter Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denotation Connotation Irony Tone Complex Symbolism Extended Metaphor and Analogy Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8

The entries listed within each cell of the matrices should be construed as neither definitive nor inclusive of all text structures and features or techniques of author's craft.

Poetry

The third type of literary text included in the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment is poetry. Like fiction, poetry has distinctive forms, functions, and structures further guided by literary structures and textual features. The matrix lays out the kinds of poetry that students encounter at different grade levels. Thus, basic poetic forms at grade 4 are narrative, lyrical, and humorous poems and free verse. Additionally at grade 8, odes, songs, and epics are included in the matrix for possible item development. More complex poetic forms are included at grade 12, such as sonnets and elegies. It is possible that two poems may be used together in intertextual item sets to allow students to

perform complex reading tasks, such as comparing thematic treatment in the two poems or contrasting two poets' choices of literary devices.

Readers use the structure of poetry to aid in comprehension. Poetic structures range from simple to complex. Students at grade 4 can be expected to be familiar with simple organizational patterns such as verse and stanza, along with the basic elements of rhyme scheme, rhythm, mood, and themes and intent. At grades 8 and 12, increasingly complex poetic organizational patterns and elements will be included for assessment. Students will also be expected to understand the use of "white space" as a structural feature of poetry.

Understanding a poet's choices also aids in understanding poetry. Language choice is of particular importance because the meaning in poetry is distilled to as few words as possible. Poets choose from among a range of rhetorical structures and figurative language, using, for example, repetition, dialogue, line organization and shape, patterns, and many forms of figurative language. Increasingly complex application of figurative language, rhetorical devices, and complex poetry arrangements are included at grades 8 and 12.

INFORMATIONAL TEXT

As stated in Chapter 1, informational text on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will be of three types: exposition, argumentation or persuasive text, and procedural text or documents. The following matrix, Exhibit 4, presents the ways informational text will be assessed at grades 4, 8, and 12. The matrix consists of three parts, each of which is accompanied by explanatory text.

EXHIBIT 4

Informational Text Matrix: Exposition

		Genre/Type of Text	Text Structures and Features	Author's Craft
EXPOSITION	GRADE 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational Trade Book • Textbook • News Article • Feature Article • Encyclopedia Entry • Book Review 	<p>Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description • Sequence (e.g., enumeration, chronology) • Cause and Effect • Problem and Solution • Comparison and Contrast <p>Content Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point of View • Topics or Central Ideas • Supporting Ideas and Evidence <p>Graphic Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Titles • Subheadings • Italics • Captions • Sidebars • Photos and Illustrations • Charts and Tables 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitional Words • Signal Words • Voice • Figurative Language and Rhetorical Structures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Parallel Structure — Quotations — Examples — Repetition — Logical Arguments
	GRADE 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical Document • Essay (e.g., informational, persuasive, analytical) • Research Report <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4</p>	Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irony • Sarcasm <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4</p>
	GRADE 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay (e.g., political, social, historical, scientific, natural history) • Literary Analysis <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8</p>	Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denotation • Connotation • Complex Symbolism • Extended Metaphor and Analogy • Paradox • Contradictions/Incongruities • Ambiguity <p>Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8</p>

The entries listed within each cell of the matrices should be construed as neither definitive nor inclusive of all text structures and features or techniques of author's craft.

Exposition

As they progress beyond the early grades, students read expository text with increasing frequency both in and out of school.³¹ The primary goals of expository text for school-age readers are to communicate information and to advance learning. Forms that may be assessed at grade 4 are informational trade books, textbook passages, news stories, feature stories, and encyclopedia entries. At grade 8, expository text genres include historical documents, various grade-appropriate essays, and research reports. More complex essay formats will be included for assessment at grade 12, such as political, social, historical, or scientific essays that have the communication of information as their primary goal.

Expository texts are characterized by internal sets of “grammars” that are similar in function to the story grammars discussed in Chapter 1. These grammars are designed to move the exposition forward and to help the reader comprehend the text. As shown in the matrix, the major organizational structures of exposition are description, sequence, cause and effect, problem and solution, and comparison and contrast.³² As mentioned in Chapter 1, exposition may also include lists as a structural component, with lists of descriptions, causes, problems, solutions, and views presented within the other structures. Commonly, exposition does not contain just one structural format, but rather combines several structures embedded in the text.

Specific elements within these organization structures signal meaning to the reader. Sequence, point of view, topics or central ideas, and supporting ideas and evidence are listed at grade 4; at grade 8 and grade 12, the structural organization and elements will be assessed at increasingly complex levels and with increasingly sophisticated texts. Some surface-level or graphic features support the text structures of exposition and guide the reader through the text. Other textual features can be categorized as reflecting author’s craft; these features guide the reader through the use of transitional words, signal words, voice, figurative language, and rhetorical structures. At grades 8 and 12, increasingly complex use of these features and of the author’s craft will be included for assessment.

³¹Broer, N.A., Aarnoutse, C.A.J., Kieviet, F.K., & Van Leeuwe, J.F.J. (2002). The effect of instructing the structural aspect of texts. *Educational Studies*, 28(3), 213–238.

³²Meyer (1975), *Op. cit.*

EXHIBIT 4 (Continued)

Informational Text Matrix: Argumentation and Persuasive Text

		Genre/Type of Text	Text Structures and Features	Author's Craft
ARGUMENTATION AND PERSUASIVE TEXT	GRADE 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational Trade Book • Journal • Speech • Simple Persuasive Essay 	<p>Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description • Sequence (e.g., enumeration, chronology) • Cause and Effect • Problem and Solution • Comparison and Contrast <p>Content Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author's Perspective or Position • Topics or Central Ideas • Supporting Ideas and Evidence • Contrasting Viewpoints and Perspectives • Presentation of the Argument (e.g., issue definition, issue choice, stance, relevance) <p>Graphic Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Titles • Subheadings • Italics • Captions • Sidebars • Photos and Illustrations • Charts and Tables 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitional Words • Signal Words • Voice • Figurative Language and Rhetorical Structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Parallel Structure — Quotations — Examples — Repetition — Exaggeration — Emotional Appeal — Tone
	GRADE 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter to the Editor • Argumentative Essay • More Complex Persuasive Essay • Editorial <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4</p>	<p>Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irony • Sarcasm • Figurative Language and Rhetorical Structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Parallel Structure — Quotations <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4</p>
	GRADE 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay (e.g., political, social) • Historical Account • Position Paper (e.g., persuasive brochure, campaign literature, advertisements) <p>Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8</p>	<p>Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4</p>	<p>Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8</p>

The entries listed within each cell of the matrices should be construed as neither definitive nor inclusive of all text structures and features or techniques of author's craft.

Argumentation and Persuasive Text

Many forms of informational text pose an argument or attempt to persuade readers toward a particular viewpoint. These texts present information to support or prove a point, to express an opinion, and to try to convince readers that a specific viewpoint is correct or justifiable. Various logical fallacies and forms of bias may be found in argumentation and persuasive text. As the matrix shows, there is considerable similarity in structure, literary features, and elements among exposition, argumentation, and persuasive text. The real distinction lies in the purpose for which an author writes these particular kinds of informational text; as stated, exposition seeks to inform and educate, whereas argumentation and persuasive text seek to influence their readers' thinking in other, often subtle but significant ways.

At grade 4, argumentation and persuasive texts listed in the matrix are informational trade books that specifically argue a position or persuade the reader toward a stance, journals, speeches, and simple persuasive essays. At grade 8, there are more complex forms of argumentation and persuasive texts: letters to the editor and editorials and argumentative and grade-appropriate persuasive essays. At grade 12, argumentation and persuasive texts become increasingly more complex with a variety of types of essays, such as political and social commentary essays; historical accounts; and position papers, such as persuasive brochures, campaign literature, and advertisements.

Particular organization techniques and elements are used to create a clear argument or to form a persuasive stand. The differences between exposition and argumentation and persuasive text lie not in the structural organization, but in the way the texts are elaborated through the use of contrasting viewpoints, shaping of arguments, appeals to emotions, and other manipulations of the elements of text and language. The organizational structures at all levels are the same as in exposition: description, sequence, cause and effect, problem and solution, and comparison and contrast; they are represented in grades 8 and 12 with increasing complexity.

Elements within these organizational structures include the author's perspective, topics or central ideas, supporting ideas, contrasting viewpoints or perspectives; and the presentation of the argument (e.g., issue definition, issue choice, stance, and relevance). These elements appear at all grade levels, with increasing complexity at higher grade levels. In addition, at grade 12 students may be asked about the structure of a given argument; connections among evidence, inferences, and claims; and the structure of a deductive vs. inductive argument. Twelfth grade students may also be asked questions about the range and quality of evidence; and logical fallacies, false assumptions/premises, loaded terms, caricature, leading questions, and faulty reasoning in argumentation and persuasive texts.

EXHIBIT 4 (Continued)

Informational Text Matrix: Procedural Texts and Documents

		Genre/Type of Text	Text Structures and Text Features
PROCEDURAL TEXTS AND /DOCUMENTS	GRADE 4	Embedded in Text <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directions • Map • Time Line • Graph • Table • Chart 	Organization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description • Procedures • Sequence (e.g., enumeration, chronology) Graphic Features <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Titles • Labels • Headings • Subheadings • Sidebars • Photos and Illustrations • Charts and Graphs • Legends
	GRADE 8	Embedded in Text <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recipe • Schedule Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4	Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4
	GRADE 12	Stand-Alone Material <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application • Manual • Product Support Material • Contract Plus Increasingly Complex Application of Grades 4 and 8	Increasingly Complex Application of Grade 4

The entries listed within each cell of the matrices should be construed as neither definitive nor inclusive of all text structures and features or techniques of author's craft.

Procedural Texts and Documents

Research indicates that adults spend considerably more time reading documents (i.e., information in matrix or graphic form) than they do reading prose materials.³³ Documents and procedural texts are indeed common in our society; for example, we interpret bus schedules, assemble simple devices, order goods from a catalog, or follow directions to set the VCR clock.

³³Guthrie, J.T., & Mosenthal, P. (1987). Literacy as multidimensional: Learning information on reading comprehension. *Educational Psychologist*, 22, 279–297; Kirsch, I.S., & Mosenthal, P.B. (1990). Exploring document literacy: Variables underlying the performance of young adults. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25, 5–30; Mosenthal, P.B. (1996). Understanding the strategies of document literacy and their conditions of use. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 88, 314–332; Mosenthal, P.B. (1998). Defining prose task characteristics for use in computer-adaptive testing and instruction. *American Education Research Journal*, 35, 269–307.

Such texts are used frequently in elementary and secondary schools, where students encounter textbooks that are replete with graphs, tables, and illustrations to accompany and expand traditional continuous text.

Procedural text may be primarily prose, arranged to show specific steps toward accomplishing a goal, or may combine both textual and graphic elements to communicate to the user. Documents, in contrast, use text sparingly, in a telescopic way that minimizes the continuous prose that readers must process to gain the information they need.

As the matrix shows, document texts on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment may include, but are not limited to, tables, and charts. Stand-alone procedural text or documents will not be included at grades 4 and 8; such text will be embedded in or ancillary to continuous text. They may appear as stand-alone stimuli at grade 12, but their use will account for only a small amount of the stimuli in the entire assessment. It is likely that many of the documents may be used as part of intertextual item sets. For example, a student might encounter a bar graph and a time line with items that relate to both texts.

Documents and procedural text features act as necessary clues to the organization of the text. As textual supports, these features guide the reader through the text. For the purposes of the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment, graphic features include titles, labels, headings, subheadings, sidebars, photos and illustrations, charts and graphs, and legends at grades 4, 8, and 12. More complex examples of these will be included at each successive grade.

CHARACTERISTICS OF TEXTS SELECTED FOR INCLUSION ON THE 2009 NAEP READING ASSESSMENT

Passages selected as stimulus material for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment must meet rigorous criteria. They will all be authentic texts of the highest quality, evidencing characteristics of good writing, coherence, and appropriateness for each grade level. Passages will be drawn from a variety of contexts that are familiar to students nationwide. Stimulus material must be engaging to students at each grade level. Further, material must reflect our literary heritage by including recognized works from varied historical periods.³⁴

It is true that children's experience differs from that of adults, and therefore the application of standards should be consonant with child life. Nevertheless, one must keep in mind the emotional maturity of the children for whom the book or books are intended. This does not mean that the works must be watered down so as to meet the reading ability levels of young children. On the contrary, some books of lasting value outstrip their vocabulary lists and connect with children on emotional-maturity levels so that they can be understood and enjoyed by the young themselves.... [T]he standards basic to good writing in adult literature are also basic to good writing for children.³⁵

³⁴ Ravitch, D. (2003). *The language police: How pressure groups restrict what students learn*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

³⁵ Georgiou, C. (1988). *Children and their literature*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, p. 46.

Most material included on the assessment will be presented in its entirety, as students would encounter it in their own reading. However, some material may be excerpted, for example, from a novel or a long essay. Excerpted material will be carefully analyzed to ensure that it is coherent in structure.

Passage Length

Material on the assessment will be of differing lengths, as shown in Exhibit 5.

EXHIBIT 5 Passage Lengths for Grades 4, 8, and 12

Grade	Range of Passage Lengths (Number of Words)
4	200 – 800
8	400 – 1,000
12	500 – 1,500

Passages of these lengths are recommended for several reasons. To gain the most valid information about students' reading, stimulus material should be as similar as possible to what students actually encounter in their in-school and out-of-school reading. Unlike many common reading tests that use short passages, NAEP will present longer material that challenges students to use their strategic reading skills in ways that reflect the kinds of reading they do in nontest situations.³⁶ Further, short passages usually will not yield approximately 10 distinct items, the required minimum number for each NAEP item set. Longer passages, with clear structural patterns, can support the development of multiple, distinct, nontrivial items that cover the range of content included in the Literary and Informational Text matrices. These items will also allow broad coverage of the cognitive targets discussed later in this chapter.

It is expected that in some cases, two poems will be used together to assess students' ability to compare them in terms of their themes and stylistic features. Prose passages used in intertextual item sets will also be fairly short. Likewise, it is possible that two documents might be included as intertextual stimuli at grade 12.

Selection of Literary and Informational Passages

Several methods of evaluating passages will be used to ensure that the best possible stimulus material is included on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. Authentic material must be of the highest quality, and it must come from authentic sources such as those students would encounter in their in-school and out-of-school reading. Material must be coherent and allow items that assess domain-specific knowledge.³⁷ Additionally, systematic efforts will be made to ensure that texts

³⁶Paris, S.G., Wasik, B.A., & Turner, C.J. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *The handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 609–640). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

³⁷Kobayashi (2002), *Op. cit.*

selected for inclusion on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will be interesting to the widest number of students. Readers become more engaged in text and consequently comprehend a selection better when they find the material interesting.³⁸ Texts will reflect our literary heritage by representing varied historical periods.

Passages selected for inclusion on the assessment will be well written, interesting to read, and “considerate,” that is, easily comprehensible because they are well organized, have appropriate vocabulary, and, where needed, have useful supplemental explanatory features such as definitions of technical terms or topographical features. Ideas marked by graphic features such as italics, bold print, and signal words and phrases tend to be processed more easily and recalled longer than unmarked information. In selecting passages, attention will be paid to written clues within text that can help readers understand structure, guide the development of main ideas, and influence the recall of information. For example, readers tend to organize and remember the emphasized information better when authors lead them with signal words indicating main ideas (for example, *the most important point here*), with phrases indicating sequencing (such as words like *first, second, third*), and with statements cross-referencing disparate parts of text.³⁹

Especially in the selection of informational text, the degree of content elaboration will be an important criterion for passage selection. Sufficient elaboration of new concepts is needed if students are to gain sufficient information to respond to questions. Tersely written informational text tends to be more difficult for students to comprehend than text written with more elaborated explanations. Whether text is tersely written or presents fully elaborated content is particularly important with topics that may be beyond the background knowledge of some students.

An inviting writing style can also enhance interest and thereby increase comprehension. Material may be interesting not because of *what* is said but because of *how* it is said. For example, writers can increase interest by using active rather than passive verbs, by including examples that make the writing less abstract, and by using vivid and unusual words. An inviting writing style also influences voice. Voice, the qualities that help a reader view text as communication between an author and a reader, can have a positive effect on recall.⁴⁰

Expert judgment will be the primary method for evaluating and selecting passages for inclusion on the assessment. Additional methods include the use of story and concept mapping and vocabulary mapping. At least two research-based readability formulas will also be used to gather

³⁸Baumann, J. (1986). Effect of rewritten textbook passages on middle-grade students' comprehension of main ideas: making the inconsiderate considerate. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 18, 1–22; Wade, S., Buxton, W., & Kelly, M. (1999). Using think-alouds to examine reader-text interest. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34(2), 194–213; Wade, S., & Moje, E. (2000). The role of text in classroom learning. Classroom language and literacy learning. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 609–627). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum; Wade, S., Schraw, G., Buxton W., & Hayes, M. (1993). Seduction of the strategic reader: Effects of interest on strategy and recall. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28(2), 92–114.

³⁹Armbruster, B.B. (1984). The problem of “inconsiderate text.” In Duffy, G.G., Roehler, I.R., & Mason, J. (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction* (pp. 202–217). New York: Longman.

⁴⁰Beck, I., McKeown, M., & Worthy, J. (1995). Giving a text voice can improve students' understanding. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 220–238.

additional information about passage difficulty.⁴¹ Passages will be thoroughly reviewed for potential bias and sensitivity issues.

Story and concept mapping⁴² procedures have been used to identify appropriate passages for previous NAEP Reading Assessments. These procedures result in a graphic representation of a possible stimulus selection that clearly highlights the hierarchical structure and the interrelatedness of the components of the passages. Story mapping, for example, will show how the setting of a story is related to and contributes to the development of plot and theme. Concept mapping shows the structure of informational text, along with the concepts presented and the relational links among concepts. Organizing information hierarchically within a passage allows the identification of the various levels of information within a text so that items can target the most important aspects of what students read. As NAEP begins to assess vocabulary in a systematic way, the story and concept mapping procedures will be modified to ensure that the words selected for item development are appropriate.

Selection of Poetry

In selecting poetry for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment, it will be important to determine that potential poems present a theme instead of stressing primarily the melodic or stylistic aspects of language use. Especially at grades 4 and 8, the theme should be implicitly presented in terms that are not so abstract that they are beyond students' comprehension. Words and phrases should be used with economy to support and amplify the meaning inherent in the text; the style should be distinguished by author's craft and project the poet's feelings about his or her topic or theme. The ideas presented must be accessible to students, and it must be clear that poetry, rather than prose, is the better mode for presenting these ideas. A good question to ask in selecting poetry is

Does the poetry, through its expression of theme and ideas, carry children beyond their immediate experiential level to extensions where language and imagination meet?⁴³

Selection of Noncontinuous Text and Documents

In addition to prose and poetry of continuous text, the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will include prose that is augmented by noncontinuous textual elements such as embedded tables or charts; it will also include stand-alone documents at grade 12. An analysis of layout will be essential to ensure that embedded noncontinuous text is used appropriately, in a way that is well integrated into the prose text and is not gratuitously distracting. Equally, stand-alone documents must be rich with appropriate information about which questions can be asked. The number of categories of information presented graphically and the clarity of the layout of documents will be essential criteria for selecting documents to be included on the assessment. The vocabulary and concept load of multimedia elements and of documents will also be considered.

⁴¹ Klare, G.R. (1984). Readability. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. I, pp. 681–744). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum; White, S., & Clement, J. (August 2001). *Assessing the Lexile framework: Results of a panel meeting, Working Paper No. 2001-08*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

⁴² Wixson, K.K., & Peters, C.W. (1987) Comprehension assessment: Implementing an interactive view of reading. *Educational Psychologist*, 22, 333–356.

⁴³ Georgiou (1988), *Op. cit.*, p. 136.

Exhibit 6 summarizes the considerations for selecting passages and documents for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. The first two columns present considerations for literary and informational continuous text. The third column presents considerations that must be made in selecting non-continuous text that is embedded within continuous text or documents that will be used as stand-alone stimulus material at grade 12. Certain considerations are considered *essential* for each kind of stimulus material and represent the fundamental characteristics that make a text or document appropriate for inclusion on NAEP. All potential stimulus material must also be *grade-appropriate* to ensure that students will be able to understand the concepts presented and have had familiarity with the stylistic features of the material. Finally, *balance* must be considered so that the assessment as a whole reflects the full range of print and non-continuous text that students encounter in their in-school and out-of-school reading.

EXHIBIT 6

Considerations for Selecting Stimulus Material for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment

Literary Text	Informational Text	Graphical Displays of Information
<p><u>Essential Characteristics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to engage readers • Well-written, rich text • Recognized literary merit • Theme/topic appropriateness by grade level <p><u>Grade Appropriateness</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complexity of characters • Number of characters • Vocabulary • Sophistication in use of literary devices • Complexity of dialogue • Point of view • Complexity of theme • Multiple themes (major/minor) • Use of time (flashbacks, progressive/digressive) • Illustrations <p><u>Balance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflective of our literary heritage • Style • Variety of sentence and vocabulary complexity • Appropriateness of mode (prose vs. poetry) • Classical as well as contemporary • Representative of varied historical periods, cultures, socio-economic backgrounds, etc. • Genre 	<p><u>Essential Characteristics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to engage readers • Well-written, considerate text • Coherence • Theme/topic appropriateness by grade level <p><u>Grade Appropriateness</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic • Vocabulary • Concepts (number, familiarity, abstractness) • Curricular appropriateness at grade level • Integrity of structure • Types of adjunct aids • Explicitness of perspective • Style <p><u>Balance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Varied content areas • Style • Genre • Variety of sentence and vocabulary complexity • Appropriateness of mode 	<p><u>Essential Characteristics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherence • Clarity • Relevance (when embedded) <p><u>Grade Appropriateness</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural complexity • Topic • Vocabulary • Concepts (number, familiarity, abstractness) • Number of categories of information presented • Amount of information within categories <p><u>Balance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embedded documents balanced with stand-alone documents (at grade 12) • Format

VOCABULARY ON THE 2009 NAEP READING ASSESSMENT

The 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will include an assessment of the vocabulary in the context of passages that students read. Vocabulary knowledge is considered to be one of the five essential components of reading as defined by the *No Child Left Behind* legislation. In this context, vocabulary is construed not as isolated word meanings but as real knowledge of vocabulary that can advance comprehension.

NAEP will not test definitions in isolation from surrounding text; that is, students will not be assessed on their prior knowledge of definitions for words in isolation. The definition of *meaning vocabulary* that will guide the development of the assessment is repeated here:

Meaning vocabulary is the application of one's understanding of word meanings to passage comprehension.

The Importance of Vocabulary for Reading Comprehension

The associations between vocabulary and learning to read and then between vocabulary and reading comprehension is well documented in research.⁴⁴ Studies have repeatedly shown that students' vocabulary is a fundamental factor in their ability to comprehend what they read. Not knowing the meaning of words as used in a given text may result in decreased comprehension of that text. Comprehending any reading passage requires knowing the meaning of the important content-bearing words of that passage, but often, the meaning of many key words in a passage depends on an interaction of word meaning and passage meaning.⁴⁵ Because of this interaction, measurement of word meaning by NAEP should be integrated with the measurement of passage comprehension.

Several major factors are known to affect readers' comprehension of what they read and can highlight the connection between word meaning and passage meaning; these include

- the context for reading (e.g., for study, for skimming, for leisure);
- fluency in identifying the words of the text;
- background or domain knowledge of the content of the text;
- knowledge of "the sense of the meaning"⁴⁶ of the words the author uses to convey important content; and
- comprehension monitoring.

⁴⁴Hart, B., & Risley, T.R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Baltimore: Brookes Publishing Company; for a complete list of references substantiating vocabulary assessment, see Appendix D.

⁴⁵Baumann, J.F., Kame'enui, E.J., & Ash, G.E. (2002). Research on vocabulary instruction: Voltaire redux. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, R. Squire, & J. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the teaching of the English language arts* (pp. 752–785). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum; Landauer, T.K., Foltz, P.W., & Laham, D. (1998) An introduction to latent semantic analysis. *Discourse Process*, 25, 259–284.

⁴⁶Miller, G.A. (1991). *The science of words*. New York: Scientific American Library.

Reasons for Assessing Vocabulary on NAEP Reading

The growing body of research documenting the link between vocabulary and reading comprehension provides a strong rationale for the inclusion of a systematic measure of vocabulary as part of the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. Past NAEP Reading Assessments have included a few vocabulary test items, all of which measured vocabulary in context; however, the number of items was scant and there were no specific vocabulary-related criteria for selecting the items or distractors. Further, NAEP reports provided no information about performance on those items or how vocabulary performance might be related to reading comprehension. This change for 2009, then, is significant. All vocabulary items will function both as a measure of passage comprehension and as a test of readers' specific knowledge of the word's meaning as intended by the passage author.

The Measurement of Meaning Vocabulary

Vocabulary items will be developed about the meaning of words as they are used in the context of the passages that students read. Students will not be asked to draw on their prior knowledge by providing a written definition of each word on a list or in a set of words. There are two reasons for this approach. First, knowledge as explicit as a written definition of a word is not the specific ability required for passage comprehension. In reality, readers may not be able to provide a complete definition of a word they encounter but do have enough of the sense of the word's meaning as used in text, that their comprehension is not impeded. A second argument against demanding specific definitions is that word meaning often depends on the context in which the word appears. Finding out whether readers know one specific definition of a word will not indicate whether they understand that word as it is used in a given text. Indeed, there is evidence that readers who know one definition of a word but not the meaning in a text try to alter the sense of the text in keeping with their known definition—leading, of course, to misunderstanding the text.⁴⁷ In addition, writers often use words in a manner that goes beyond concrete, familiar definitions but do so in ways that skilled readers can interpret effectively. Jacques Barzun describes this:

Language is not an algebra; that is, the symbols do not stay put, nor can they be carried from place to place with an assurance that their value will not change. If language were like an algebra there could be no poetry or other fiction, no diplomacy or intimate correspondence, no persuasion or religious literature. If language were like an algebra, uncomfortable would mean not able to be comforted, and a myriad other nuances of human feelings would have to remain unrecorded and unshared.⁴⁸

Considerations for Selecting Vocabulary to Be Assessed

In selecting passages for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment, test developers must create a “map” of the story or the expository selection to identify the key features of the passage. This procedure has included identifying candidates for vocabulary items, but the process will be enhanced to ensure that passages contain enough candidate words or terms for item development.

⁴⁷Deegan, D.H. (1995). Exploring individual differences among novices reading in a specific domain: The case of law. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 154–170.

⁴⁸Barzun, J. (1987). *Simple and direct*. New York: Harper Row.

The intent of the vocabulary assessment on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment is to determine whether readers know and understand the meanings of the words that writers use to convey new information or meaning, not to measure readers' ability to learn new terms or words. Hence, the assessment will focus on words that characterize the vocabulary of mature language users and characterize written rather than oral language. The words selected for item development will convey concepts, ideas, actions, or feelings that the readers most likely know. In general, the words selected as targets for item development characterize the language of mature readers and are used in texts from a variety of content domains.⁴⁹ Considerations for selecting words for item development are summarized in Exhibit 7.

EXHIBIT 7

Considerations for Selecting Vocabulary Items and Distractors for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment

Vocabulary Words to Be Tested	Vocabulary Words Excluded From Testing	Considerations for Distractors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Characterize the vocabulary of mature language users and characterize written rather than oral language Label generally familiar and broadly understood concepts, even though the words themselves may not be familiar to younger learners Are necessary for understanding at least a local part of the context and are linked to central ideas such that lack of understanding may disrupt comprehension Are found in grade-level reading material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are narrowly defined and are not widely useful, such as those related to specific content domains (e.g., photosynthesis, fiduciary) or words with limited application (e.g., deserter, hamlet) Label or name the main idea of the passage (e.g., the word "emancipation" would not be tested in an article dealing with the "Emancipation Proclamation") Are those already likely to be part of students' everyday speaking vocabulary at the grade level Are those whose meanings are readily derived from language context (e.g., appositives, parenthetical definitions, idiomatic expressions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present a more common meaning of the target vocabulary word, which must be ignored in favor of the meaning in context May present correct information or content from the text that is NOT what is meant by the target word May be an alternative interpretation of the context in which the target word occurs May be other words that look or sound similar to the target word

Words that are appropriate for inclusion on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment denote concepts or things that readers already know. That is, the word denotes an object, idea, feeling, or action that has been experienced or has been seen by the readers. However, the test item is not designed to determine whether readers know the thing, but rather whether readers are able to link this knowledge (object, idea, feeling, action) to the word the author uses to convey this meaning. NAEP presumes that most readers will likely have the background knowledge of the object, idea, feeling, or action in a passage, but—because the words are difficult and uncommon—readers may not readily

⁴⁹Beck, McKeown, and Kucan refer to these as "tier 2" words. This term distinguishes them from tier 1 words, common, everyday words basic to the speech and writing of most students, and from tier 3 words, rarely used words or technical terminology. See Beck, McKeown, and Kucan (2002), as cited in Appendix D.

link that knowledge to the specific word the author uses to convey that meaning. If readers do not connect a meaning with the author's word, their comprehension will suffer. The NAEP vocabulary items are designed to test readers' ability to connect an appropriate meaning to the candidate words to gain comprehension. Thus, test items will not target technical terms or words identifying the central idea(s) of the passage because those words often represent new knowledge, concepts, or conceptualizations for readers. Passage comprehension items will measure readers' learning from text; vocabulary items will measure readers' knowledge of certain important words the author uses to impart this meaning.

Clearly, some readers will know and understand some test words before taking the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. This is unavoidable, and these students will probably be highly able readers. Further, we anticipate that some readers will not have the background to link to the author's words and thus will either choose an incorrect response for the item because of their background knowledge or identify the meaning of the word from context and mark the correct response. These are again probably advanced readers. Recognizing this possibility, NAEP will ensure that the vocabulary test items represent a continuum of difficulty across readers at a given grade (as will reading passages and comprehension items). The intent is to identify words that the majority of grade-level students do not generally use in speaking or writing, but that such students have seen or heard at least a few times.

COGNITIVE TARGETS FOR THE 2009 NAEP READING ASSESSMENT

Items will be developed for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment to assess students' comprehension of literary and informational text. The term **cognitive targets** refers to the mental processes or kinds of thinking that underlie reading comprehension. Test questions will be aligned to cognitive dimensions that are applicable to literary and informational texts and also to cognitive dimensions that are specific to each text type. The remainder of the chapter presents these cognitive dimensions that are targeted by the items (hence the term **cognitive targets**) and discusses the item types that are included on the assessment. Inclusion of specific cognitive targets in the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework reflects the intent of the definition of reading that guides the assessment. The definition, explained in Chapter 1, follows:

Reading is an active and complex process that involves

- understanding written text;
- developing and interpreting meaning; and
- using meaning as appropriate to type of text, purpose, and situation.

Reading Processes Included in the Cognitive Target Matrices

The reading processes included in the three sections of the cognitive target matrix, Exhibit 8, illustrate the complex nature of reading. The research literature contains numerous studies that show how students use different reading processes when reading various types of text (see Chapter 1). Hence, the sections of the matrix representing literary and informational text emphasize that different texts elicit different kinds of reading behaviors. The reading processes presented in the matrix are also grounded in the research literature on comprehension, most specifically the literature that uses

protocol analysis (“think-alouds”) as its research methodology.⁵⁰ Further, they reflect the cognitive processes that are assessed on international reading assessments, the Progress in International Reading and Literacy Study (PIRLS)⁵¹ and the Programme for Student Assessment (PISA).⁵² The behaviors presented in Exhibit 8 are illustrative, not comprehensive. The *Specifications for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment* will provide a detailed listing of the cognitive targets for item development.

Locate and Recall

The first cognitive behaviors are *locate* and *recall*. As students locate or recall information from what they read, they may identify clearly stated main ideas or supporting details or they may find essential elements of a story, such as characters, time, or setting. Their process in answering assessment items often involves matching information given in the item to either literal or synonymous information in the text before they can then use the textual information to develop a response. As readers engage in these behaviors, they monitor their reading in order to understand when they are comprehending and when they are not. When they realize that the text is not making sense, they employ specific strategies to ensure that they begin to comprehend again.

A salient activity [in reading] is to find the main ideas in the text and make certain that these ideas are remembered—or at least can be found again if needed. The big ideas, of course, are always relative to the goals of the reading with respect to the text. That is, very different ideas may be considered main ideas if a reader is reading for one purpose versus another.⁵³

Items assessing this component of reading usually focus on information contained in relatively small amounts of text—a sentence, a paragraph, or two or more adjacent paragraphs. These items provide information about the most basic comprehension skills, those that ultimately form the foundation for a more elaborated understanding of what is read. At the same time, these items address the kinds of reading that occur routinely in school and out-of-school reading activities.

Regardless of a reader’s goal—whether reading is done in preparation for a test, in anticipation of a writing assignment, with the expectation of sharing it in a conversation, to determine an author’s perspective, or as part of staying abreast in an area of interest—it is necessary to identify the important information in a text.⁵⁴

⁵⁰Garner, R. (1982). Verbal-report data on reading strategies. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 14, 159–167; Guthrie, J., Britten, T., & Barker, K. (1991). Roles of document structure, cognitive strategy, and awareness in searching for information. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25, 300–324; Norris, S., & Phillips, L.M. (1987). Explanations of reading comprehension: Schema theory and critical thinking theory. *Teachers College Record*, 38, 281–306; Pressley & Afflerbach, (1995), *Op. cit.*; Olshavsky, J. (1976–77). Reading as problem solving: An investigation of strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 12, 654–674.

⁵¹ Campbell, Kelly, Mullis, Martin, & Sainsburg (2001) *Op. cit.*

⁵² Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2000), *Op. cit.*

⁵³Pressley & Afflerbach (1995), *Op. cit.*, p. 44.

⁵⁴Pressley & Afflerbach (1995), *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

Integrate and Interpret

The next set of reading behaviors refers to what readers do as they *integrate* new information into their initial sense of what a passage says, often *interpreting* what they read in the process. When readers engage in behaviors involving integrating and interpreting, they make comparisons and contrasts of information or character actions, examine relations across aspects of text, or consider alternatives to what is presented in text. This aspect of the reading is critical to comprehension and can be considered the stage in which readers really move beyond the discrete information, ideas, details, themes, and so forth presented in text and extend their initial impressions by processing information logically and completely. As readers integrate information and interpret what they read, they frequently form questions, use mental images, and make connections that draw on larger sections of text, often at an abstract level. They are also drawing on their knowledge of the structure and elements of literary and informational text.

In applying these behaviors, readers invariably think across large portions of text, across the text as a whole, or even across multiple texts; they relate textual information to knowledge from other sources, such as their previous content learning, or to internalized criteria and logic. Thus, readers might ask themselves whether something they are reading makes sense to them within the realm of their own experiences or when considered against what they have read in other sources. They examine the text in terms of their specific reading goals or the needs they have for the information that the text can provide to them. In certain reading situations, readers may apply what they know to what they are reading, for example, determining a real-world application of suggestions in a text on bicycle safety. They also apply information gained from reading, for example, in following instructions for repairing a bicycle or reading a map to determine where bike routes have been designated in a city.

Readers are aware of many different aspects of text and the reading task they are performing from the outset of reading. Their perceptions of the text and how it relates to their task/reading goals does much to shape the processing of text, with readers processing some parts of the text superficially and others very carefully. . . . Good readers not only know what they are doing, but why they are doing it, ever aware of the characteristics of text they are confronting and their own reading goals.⁵⁵

Items assessing these behaviors might ask students to form generalizations about a piece of informational text or make statements about how the setting of a story contributes to the creation of theme. Other items might require interpretation, for example, of a character's motivations or of an author's reasons for attempting to persuade readers about an issue. Other questions might ask for alternative actions that a character might have taken, or an interpretation of an implied message or moral from a story.

Critique and Evaluate

The final set of reading behaviors—*critiquing* and *evaluating* text—requires readers to stand back from what they read and view the text objectively. The focus remains on the text itself, but the readers' purpose is to consider the text critically by assessing the text from numerous perspectives

⁵⁵Pressley & Afflerbach (1995), *Op cit.*, p. 68.

and synthesizing what is read with other texts and other experiences. Items may ask students to evaluate the quality of the text as a whole, to determine what is most significant in a passage, or to judge the effectiveness of specific textual features to accomplish the purpose of the text (e.g., the effectiveness of details selected to support a persuasive argument). Items might ask for the likelihood that an event could actually have taken place, the plausibility of an argument, or the adequacy of an explanation for an event. Items can ask students to focus at the level of language choices (e.g., nuances expressed in a metaphor) or at the broader level of the entire text (e.g., evaluating the effectiveness of an author's craft to accomplish his or her overall goals). To answer these questions, students draw on what they know about text, about language, and about the ways authors manipulate language and ideas to achieve their goals.

Sometimes readers recognize from the very start that they are likely to be evaluative with respect to a text, and likely to react to it affectively. . . . Although some readers evidence great consistency in their evaluative stances as they read some texts, evaluations are often much more discriminated. Regardless of whether a reader is globally positive, globally negative, or a mixture of both, evaluations occur with respect to the style and context of text.⁵⁶

Assessing the Cognitive Targets

Exhibit 8 presents the cognitive target matrix for the development of items to be used on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. The term **cognitive targets** is used to refer to the mental processes or kinds of thinking that underlie reading comprehension; the cognitive targets serve to guide the test development process in that item writers “target” these processes or kinds of thinking as they write items. The cognitive targets remain the same across all three grades on the assessment, but the passages and documents about which items are developed will be of increasing sophistication at each grade.

⁵⁶Pressley & Afflerbach (1995), *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

EXHIBIT 8

Cognitive Targets for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment⁵⁷

	Locate/Recall	Integrate/Interpret	Critique/Evaluate
Both Literary and Informational Text	<p>Identify textually explicit information and make simple inferences within and across texts, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions • Facts • Supporting details 	<p>Make complex inferences within and across texts to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe problem and solution, cause and effect • Compare or connect ideas, problems, or situations • Determine unstated assumptions in an argument • Describe how an author uses literary devices and text features 	<p>Consider text(s) critically to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judge author's craft and technique • Evaluate the author's perspective or point of view within or across texts • Take different perspectives in relation to a text
Specific to Literary Text	<p>Identify textually explicit information within and across texts, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Character traits • Sequence of events or actions • Setting <p>Identify figurative language</p>	<p>Make complex inferences within and across texts to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infer mood or tone • Integrate ideas to determine theme • Identify or interpret a character's motivations and decisions • Examine relations between theme and setting or characters <p>Explain how rhythm, rhyme, or form in poetry contribute to meaning</p>	<p>Consider text(s) critically to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the role of literary devices in conveying meaning • Determine the degree to which literary devices enhance a literary work • Evaluate a character's motivations and decisions • Analyze the point of view used by the author
Specific to Informational Text	<p>Identify textually explicit information within and across texts, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic sentence or main idea • Author's purpose • Causal relations <p>Locate specific information in text or graphics</p>	<p>Make complex inferences within and across texts to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize major ideas • Draw conclusions and provide supporting information • Find evidence in support of an argument • Distinguish facts from opinions • Determine the importance of the information within and across texts 	<p>Consider text(s) critically to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze the presentation of information • Evaluate the way the author selects language to influence readers • Evaluate the strength and quality of evidence used by the author to support his or her position • Determine the quality of counterarguments within and across texts • Judge the coherence, logic, or credibility of an argument

⁵⁷The Cognitive Targets matrix is for illustrative purposes only and should not be considered an exhaustive list. The cognitive targets will be elaborated further in the *Specifications for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment*.

Items will be developed to assess all the cognitive targets at each grade level, but the distribution of cognitive targets will vary across grades. In determining the distribution across the grade levels, careful thought was given to the kinds of texts that students encounter at each level. Reference was also made to the distribution across reading processes in the two international reading assessments, PISA and PIRLS.⁵⁸ Exhibit 9 displays the distribution of cognitive targets across grades 4, 8, and 12.

EXHIBIT 9

Distribution of Cognitive Targets by Grade

Grade	Locate/Recall	Integrate/Interpret	Critique/Evaluate
4	30%	50%	20%
8	20%	50%	30%
12	20%	45%	35%

ITEM TYPES ON THE 2009 NAEP READING ASSESSMENT

The 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will include multiple-choice and constructed-response items. Both item types yield valuable information about students' reading and allow a rich, full description of how the nation's students approach different kinds of text. The inclusion of both types of items on the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment affirms the complex nature of the reading process because it recognizes that different kinds of information can be gained from each item type. It also acknowledges the real-world skill of being able to write about what one has read.

Multiple-choice items will include four options: the right response and three incorrect responses. It is assumed that a multiple-choice item will take students approximately one minute to complete. Short constructed-response items can be answered by one or two phrases or by one or two sentences; they should take students approximately two to three minutes to complete. Extended constructed-response items should elicit longer, more elaborated answers of a paragraph or two. They should take students approximately five minutes to complete. Scoring rubrics for short and extended constructed-response items will focus on the content included in answers, not on spelling or grammatical considerations. However, students must answer constructed-response questions by using information from the text to receive credit. Details regarding the scoring and short and extended constructed-response items appear in the *Specifications for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment*, which will be published separately.⁵⁹

The distribution of multiple-choice and constructed-response items will vary across the grades assessed by the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. The percentages in Exhibit 10 refer to the

⁵⁸ Campbell, Kelly, Mullis, Martin, & Sainsbury (2001), *Op. cit.*; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2000), *Op. cit.*

⁵⁹An accompanying document, the *Specifications for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment*, will guide the development of the assessment. It will provide detailed information about the kinds of reading selections to be included, item types, and scoring criteria for constructed-response items. The Specifications will also discuss test administration procedures, any considerations to be given to special populations, and special studies to be conducted in conjunction with the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment (see Appendix B).

amount of assessment time that students will spend responding to these particular kinds of items. Hence, grade 4 students will spend approximately 50 percent of the assessment time responding to multiple-choice items and 50 percent of the assessment time preparing written responses. Students at grades 8 and 12 will spend more time preparing written responses.

Approximately two items per passage will assess vocabulary knowledge. These items may be either multiple choice or short constructed response in format. Exhibit 10 shows the distribution of time to be spent on each kind of item.

EXHIBIT 10
Distribution of Time to Be Spent on Specific Item Types

Grade	Multiple Choice	Short Constructed Response	Extended Constructed Response
4	50%	40%	10%
8	40%	45%	15%
12	40%	45%	15%

Less time is allocated to constructed-response items at grade 4 to reflect the developmental differences across the three grades that are assessed. Students at grade 4 may not be as familiar with written responses to reading questions as older students are.⁶⁰

⁶⁰Kobayashi (2002), *Op. cit.*

CHAPTER 3

REPORTING THE RESULTS OF THE NAEP READING ASSESSMENT

Results of the NAEP Reading Assessment administrations are reported in terms of average scores for groups of students on the NAEP 0–500 scale and as percentages of students who attain each of the three achievement levels, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced, discussed below. The NAEP Reading Assessment is an assessment of overall achievement, not a tool for diagnosing the needs of individuals or groups of students. Reported scores are always at the aggregate level. By law, scores are not produced for individual schools or students. Results are reported for the nation as a whole, for regions of the nation, for states, and for large districts that volunteer to participate in the NAEP trial urban district assessments.

No Child Left Behind Provisions for NAEP Reporting

Under the provisions of the *No Child Left Behind* legislation, states receiving Title I grants must include assurance in their state plans that they will participate in reading and mathematics state NAEP at grades 4 and 8. Local districts that receive Title I funds must agree that they will participate in biennial NAEP administrations at grades 4 and 8 if they are selected to do so. Their results will be included in state and national reporting. Participation in NAEP will not substitute for the mandated state-level assessments in reading and mathematics at grades 3 to 8.

In 2002, NAEP initiated a Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) in five large urban school districts that are members of the Council of Great City Schools (Atlanta City, City of Chicago, Houston Independent School District, Los Angeles Unified, and New York City Public Schools). Ten large districts participated in 2003, and 10 will take part in the 2005 TUDA. Large districts that participate in the urban district assessment in the future will receive their own data, which they can use for assessing the achievement of their own students and for comparative purposes.

Achievement Levels

Since 1990, NAGB has used student achievement levels for reporting results on NAEP assessments. The achievement levels represent an informed judgment of “how good is good enough” in the various subjects that are assessed. Generic policy definitions for achievement at the Basic, Proficient, and Advanced levels describe in very general terms what students at each grade level should know and be able to do on the assessment. Reading achievement levels specific to the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework will be developed to elaborate the generic definitions of Basic, Proficient, and Advanced achievement as demonstrated on NAEP assessments. New reading-specific achievement-level descriptors will replace those aligned to the previous framework.⁶¹ Preliminary achievement-level descriptors have been developed for the assessment as a whole and

⁶¹National Assessment Governing Board. (2003). *Reading framework for the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, DC: Author.

for the vocabulary component of the assessment. These preliminary achievement levels will be used to guide item development and initial stages of standard setting for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment. The preliminary achievement-level descriptions will be refined as a result of the achievement-level-setting process.

Exhibits 11, 12, and 13 present the generic achievement level descriptors and the preliminary achievement-level descriptions.

EXHIBIT 11
Generic Achievement Levels for the
National Assessment of Educational Progress

Achievement Level	Policy Definition
Advanced	This level signifies superior performance.
Proficient	This level represents solid academic performance for each grade assessed. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.
Basic	This level denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.

EXHIBIT 12

Preliminary Achievement Levels for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment

GRADE 4		
Achievement Level	Literary	Informational
Advanced	<p>Grade 4 students at the <i>Advanced</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpret figurative language • Make complex inferences • Identify point of view • Evaluate character motivation • Describe thematic connections across literary texts 	<p>Grade 4 students at the <i>Advanced</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make complex inferences • Evaluate the coherence of a text • Explain author's point of view • Compare ideas across texts
Proficient	<p>Grade 4 students at the <i>Proficient</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infer character motivation • Interpret mood or tone • Explain theme • Identify similarities across texts • Identify elements of author's craft 	<p>Grade 4 students at the <i>Proficient</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify author's implicitly stated purpose • Summarize major ideas • Find evidence in support of an argument • Distinguish between fact and opinion • Draw conclusions
Basic	<p>Grade 4 students at the <i>Basic</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate textually explicit information, such as plot, setting, and character • Make simple inferences • Identify supporting details • Describe character's motivation • Describe the problem • Identify mood 	<p>Grade 4 students at the <i>Basic</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Find the topic sentence or main idea • Identify supporting details • Identify author's explicitly stated purpose • Make simple inferences

EXHIBIT 12 (Continued)
Preliminary Achievement Levels for the 2009
NAEP Reading Assessment

GRADE 8		
Achievement Level	Literary	Informational
Advanced	<p>Grade 8 students at the <i>Advanced</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make complex inferences • Critique point of view • Evaluate character motivation • Describe thematic connections across literary texts • Evaluate how an author uses literary devices to convey meaning 	<p>Grade 8 students at the <i>Advanced</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make complex inferences • Evaluate author's purpose • Evaluate strength and quality of supporting evidence • Compare and contrast ideas across texts • Critique causal relations
Proficient	<p>Grade 8 students at the <i>Proficient</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make inferences that describe problem and solution, cause and effect • Analyze character motivation • Interpret mood or tone • Explain theme • Identify similarities across texts • Analyze how an author uses literary devices to convey meaning • Interpret figurative language 	<p>Grade 8 students at the <i>Proficient</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize major ideas • Draw conclusions • Provide evidence in support of an argument • Describe author's purpose • Analyze and interpret implicit causal relations
Basic	<p>Grade 8 students at the <i>Basic</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpret textually explicit information • Make inferences • Identify supporting details • Identify character's motivation • Describe the problem • Identify mood 	<p>Grade 8 students at the <i>Basic</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate the main idea • Distinguish between fact and opinion • Make inferences • Identify author's explicitly stated purpose • Recognize explicit causal relations

EXHIBIT 12 (Continued)
Preliminary Achievement Levels for the 2009
NAEP Reading Assessment

GRADE 12		
Achievement Level	Literary	Informational
Advanced	<p>Grade 12 students at the <i>Advanced</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make complex inferences • Critique point of view • Evaluate character motivation • Explain thematic connections across literary texts • Analyze and evaluate how an author uses literary devices to convey meaning. 	<p>Grade 12 students at the <i>Advanced</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the quality of supporting evidence • Critique point of view • Analyze causal relations • Critique the presentation of information • Evaluate the quality of counterarguments within and across texts
Proficient	<p>Grade 12 students at the <i>Proficient</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine relations between theme, setting, or character • Make inferences that describe problem and solution, cause and effect • Analyze character motivation • Interpret mood or tone • Integrate ideas to determine theme • Analyze how an author uses literary devices to convey meaning 	<p>Grade 12 students at the <i>Proficient</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Find evidence in support of an argument • Integrate information from a variety of sources • Determine unstated assumptions • Analyze point of view • Judge the logic, coherence, or credibility of an argument
Basic	<p>Grade 12 students at the <i>Basic</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpret textually explicit information • Make inferences • Describe character's motivation • Recognize alternative interpretations or point of view • Explain the theme • Explain how the message is affected by the genre • Identify elements of an author's style 	<p>Grade 12 students at the <i>Basic</i> level should be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize the main idea • Identify key details • Identify author's purpose • Identify causal relations • Draw conclusions

The preliminary achievement level statements describe important reading skills that students should have mastered at grades 4, 8, and 12 at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels. At each grade, the proficient level reflects competency in various literacy skills, including vocabulary, when reading a range of literary and informational texts. In addition, the framework committees believe that 12th grade students performing at the proficient level possess reading and analytical skills needed for rigorous college-level courses and other productive postsecondary endeavors.

Exhibit 13 presents the preliminary achievement level descriptions for vocabulary. The descriptions are not presented by grade level, but instead refer to achievement at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels when students encounter grade-appropriate text. Students at grades 4, 8, and 12 will differ in the number of words they know and must apply their vocabulary skills to increasingly sophisticated texts at each grade.

EXHIBIT 13

Preliminary Achievement Levels: Vocabulary

Achievement Level	Description
Advanced	Advanced readers will have outstanding vocabularies, with a sound knowledge of words and terms well beyond their grade level. In addition, they will have an excellent grasp of the multiple meanings of an extensive set of words and complex networks of associations to the words they know. They will also have a strong base of words that identify complex and abstract ideas and concepts. Finally, their sophistication with words and word meanings will enable them to be highly flexible in extending the senses of words they know to appropriately fit different contexts.
Proficient	Proficient readers will have sizable meaning vocabularies, including knowledge of many words and terms above grade level. They will also have greater depth of knowledge of words, beyond the most common meaning. Proficient readers will be flexible with word meanings and able to extend the senses of words whose meanings they know in order to appropriately fit different contexts and understand passage meaning.
Basic	Readers at the basic level will generally have limited, concrete vocabularies that consist primarily of words at and below grade level. Knowledge of these words will be limited to the most familiar definition, making it difficult to identify the appropriate meaning of a word among the distractors.

Reporting NAEP Results

NAEP Reading Assessment results are reported in terms of average scores for groups of students on the NAEP 0 – 500 scale and as percentages of students who attain each of the three achievement levels, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. Information is also provided about students who score below Basic on the assessment. These students are not necessarily nonreaders; many can complete some tasks on the assessment but are not able to attain the minimum score on the NAEP scale to be designated at the Basic level.

Data are reported on subgroups of students by gender, race/ethnicity, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch, region of the country, type of community, public or nonpublic school, and other variables of interest. Data are never provided for individual students or schools. Subscores should be provided for literary and informational texts. Results will also be provided about students' responses to the vocabulary items.

It is recommended that the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment results continue to use a 0 – 500 cross-grade scale. Use of such a scale affirms that reading is a development process, in that students'

reading skills mature throughout their school years as they read increasingly diverse and sophisticated texts.

The primary vehicles for reporting NAEP reading results are the *Reading Highlights* and *Reading Report Cards* that are issued after each assessment administration. These reports provide detailed information on the assessments, the students who participated, and the assessment results. Results are disaggregated by specific groups and are also presented for states that participate in the NAEP state assessment. Among the focal groups are males and females, students from various racial/ethnic backgrounds, and students who took the assessment with and without accommodations.

NAEP data and information about the assessments are also available electronically through the NAGB (www.nagb.org) and the National Center for Education Statistics/NAEP (nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard) Web sites. Further, the *NAEP Report Generator* tool can be used by interested education administrators, researchers, and other stakeholders to develop focused reports. The *NAEP e-Library* (nces.ed.gov) provides other information; access to NAEP reports, sample assessment passages, items, scoring rubrics with student-constructed responses; and data sources for more in-depth analysis of student achievement results or of the assessments themselves.

Reporting State NAEP Results

As discussed above, states receiving Title I funding must participate in the NAEP Reading Assessment at grades 4 and 8. Results are reported in the aggregate for participating students and are also disaggregated for specific reference groups of students. Individual state reports are generated in addition to reports that contrast results from participating states and from the nation as a whole. The *NAEP Report Generator*, mentioned above, allows state and local administrators and others to customize reports and to investigate specific aspects of student reading achievement.

Reporting Trend Data

According to NAEP law and NAGB policy, long-term trend assessments are conducted as part of NAEP to continue the national trend reports, which, in reading, have been administered since 1971. The long-term trend reports provide the only continuous measures of student achievement over such extended periods of time. Passages and accompanying test items administered as part of the long-term trend assessments have remained unchanged from their initial administration in 1971.

The 2009 NAEP Reading Framework represents several important changes from the framework that has guided the assessment since 1992 (see Exhibit 2 in Chapter 1). These changes are significant enough that the reading trend line from the 1992 assessment will be broken; a new trend line will be instituted to reflect student achievement in reading throughout the use of the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework.

NAEP reports are useful in providing trend results over time to inform decisions and allocations of resources and framing of policy about reading. The questions that NAEP addresses include these:

- Are students improving in reading achievement over time?
- Are percentages of students at the upper achievement levels increasing, decreasing, or remaining the same?

-
- Are the gaps in achievement among various groups narrowing?

Assessments aligned to the 1992 Framework and its subsequent versions will have yielded trend data from seven national and six state administrations, as shown in Exhibit 14.

EXHIBIT 14

Years of Administration of NAEP Reading Assessments Aligned to the 1992 Framework

Year	Grades for National Administration	Grades for State Administration
1992	4, 8, 12	4
1994	4, 8, 12	4
1998	4, 8, 12	4, 8
2000	4	
2003	4, 8, 12	4, 8
2005	4, 8, 12	4, 8
2007	4, 8	4, 8

Background Variables

Students participating in the NAEP assessments respond to background questionnaires that gather information on variables that are important to understanding reading achievement nationwide. Teachers and school administrators also complete background questionnaires to gather relevant data. To the extent possible, information is also gathered from non-NAEP sources, such as state, district, or school records, to minimize the burden on those who are asked to complete the questionnaires. Questions are nonintrusive; free from bias; and secular, neutral, and nonideological. The questions do not elicit personal feelings, values, or attitudes.

As stated in NAGB policy, background data on students, teachers, and schools are needed to fulfill the statutory requirement that NAEP include information, whenever feasible, disaggregated by race or ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, disability, and limited English proficiency. Background information serves the additional purpose of enriching the reporting of NAEP results by examining factors related to academic achievement in the specific subjects that are assessed.

To satisfy the goal of enriching reports on student achievement in reading, background variables are selected to be of topical interest, to be timely, and to be directly related to academic achievement. The selection of variables about which questions will be developed may reflect current trends in the field, such as the use of technology in reading instruction or the extent to which students use the Internet as a reference tool. Recommendations on background variables for the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will be presented as a separate document.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

This glossary provides brief definitions of terms used throughout the NAEP Reading Framework. The terms are defined according to their use in the Framework. Included in the list are terms that relate to types of reading materials, text structures and features, techniques of author's craft, and other key terms used in the Framework.

Allegory: a story in which the characters, settings, and events stand for abstract moral concepts.

Alliteration: the repetition of initial consonant sounds.

Allusion: a reference to a mythological, literary, or historical person, place, or thing.

Analogy: a comparison of two things to show their likenesses in certain respects.

Argumentation: writing that seeks to influence through appeals that direct readers to specific goals or try to win them to specific beliefs.

Audience: a writer's targeted reader or readers.

Author's craft: the specific techniques that an author chooses to relay an intended message.

Autobiography: a written account of the author's own life.

Ballad: a song or songlike poem that tells a story.

Biography: an account of a person's life written by another person.

Causation: a text structure that presents causal or cause and effect relationships between the ideas presented in the text.

Cognitive target: a mental process or kind of thinking that underlies reading comprehension; cumulatively, the cognitive targets will guide the development of items for the assessment.

Coherence: the continuity of meaning that enables others to make sense of a text.

Comic relief: an event or character that serves as an antidote to the seriousness of dramatic events.

Comparison: a text structure in which ideas are related to one another on the basis of similarities and differences. The text presents ideas that are organized to compare, to contrast, or to provide an alternative perspective.

Conflict: a struggle or clash between opposing characters, forces, or emotions.

Connotation: the implicit rather than explicit meaning of a word. It consists of the suggestions, associations, and emotional overtones attached to a word.

Description: a text structure that presents a topic, along with the attributes, specifics, or setting information that describe that topic.

Denotation: the exact, literal definition of a word independent of any emotional association or secondary meaning.

Detail: a fact revealed by the author or speaker that supports the attitude or tone in a piece of poetry or prose. In informational text, details provide information to support the author's main point.

Diction: word choice intended to convey a certain effect.

Elegy: a poem that mourns the death of a person or laments something lost.

Epic: a long narrative poem that relates the great deeds of a hero who embodies the values of a particular society.

Exaggeration or Hyperbole: a deliberate, extravagant, and often outrageous overstatement. It may be used for either serious or comic effect.

Exposition: one of the classifications of discourse whose function is to inform or to instruct or to present ideas and general truths objectively. Exposition presents information, provides explanations and definitions, and compares and contrasts.

Fable: a brief story that teaches a moral or practical lesson about life.

Fantasy: a story employing imaginary characters living in fictional settings where the rules of the real world are altered for effect.

Fiction: imaginative literary works representing invented rather than actual persons, places, and events.

Figure of speech: a word or phrase that describes one thing in terms of something else, often involving an imaginative comparison between seemingly unlike things.

Flashback: a scene that interrupts the action of a work to show a previous event.

Fluency: the ability to read text quickly and accurately and comprehend what is read.

Foil: a character who sets off another character by strong contrast.

Folktale: a short story from the oral tradition that reflects the mores and beliefs of a particular culture.

Foreshadowing: the use of hints or clues in a narrative to suggest future action.

Free verse: poetry that has no regular meter or rhyme scheme.

Genre: a category used to classify literary and other works by form, technique, or content.

Grammar: a coherent text structure on which readers rely as they seek to understand what they read; often referred to as “story grammar”.

Graphic: a pictorial representation of data or ideas using columns, matrices, or other formats. Graphics can be simple or complex, present information in a straightforward way as in a list or pie graph, or embed or “nest” information within the document’s structure. Graphics may be included in texts or be “stand-alone” documents (grade 12 only).

Historical fiction: a story that recreates a period or event in history and often uses historical figures as characters.

Iambic pentameter: a line of poetry made up of five metrical feet or units of measure, consisting of an unstressed syllable followed by a stressed syllable.

Imagery: multiple words or a continuous phrase that a writer uses to represent persons, objects, actions, feelings, and ideas descriptively by appealing to the senses.

Inference: the act or process of deriving logical conclusions from premises known or assumed to be true; the conclusions drawn from this process.

Irony: the tension that arises from the discrepancy, either between what one says and what one means (verbal irony), between what a character believes and what a reader knows (dramatic irony) or between what occurs and what one expects to occur (situational irony).

Legend: an inscription or title on an object (e.g., a key to symbols used on a map).

Literary device: a literary technique used to achieve a particular effect.

Literary heritage: works by authors whose writing influenced and continues to influence the public language, thinking, history, literary culture, and politics of this nation. These works comprise the literary and intellectual capital drawn on by later writers.

Literary nonfiction: a text that conveys factual information. The text may or may not employ a narrative structure and characteristics such as dialogue.

Lyrical poetry: poems that focus on expressing emotions or thoughts.

Meaning Vocabulary: the application of one’s understanding of word meanings to passage comprehension.

Memoir: a type of autobiography that usually focuses on a single time period or historical event.

Metaphor: a comparison of two unlike things without the use of “like” or “as”.

Mixed Text: text that employs literary techniques usually associated with narrative or poetry while also presenting information or factual material with the dual purpose of informing and offering reading satisfaction; requires readers to discern bias from fact.

Monologue: a long, formal speech made by a character.

Mood: the atmosphere or predominant emotion in a literary work.

Motivation: a circumstance or set of circumstances that prompts a character to act a certain way or that determines the outcome of a situation or work.

Myth: a traditional story accepted as history, which serves to explain the world view of a people.

Narration: the telling of a story in writing.

Narrative poetry: poems that tell a story in verse, often focusing on a single incident.

Ode: a long lyric poem on a serious subject often for ceremonial or public occasions.

Onomatopoeia: the use of words that mimic the sounds they describe; imitative harmony.

Parody: the imitation of a work of literature, art, or music for amusement or instruction.

Parallel structure: the repetition of words, phrases, or sentences that have the same grammatical structure or that restate a similar idea.

Personification: a metaphor that gives inanimate objects or abstract ideas human characteristics.

Perspective: a position, stance, or viewpoint from which something is considered or evaluated.

Persuasion: a form of discourse whose function is to convince an audience or to prove or refute a point of view or an issue.

Plot: the sequence of events or actions in a short story, novel, or narrative poem.

Point of view: the perspective or vantage point from which a literary work is told, or the way in which the author reveals characters, actions, and ideas.

Problem/Solution: a text structure in which the main ideas are organized into two parts: a problem and a subsequent solution that responds to the problem or a question and an answer that responds to the question.

Procedural text: a text that conveys information in the form of directions for accomplishing a task. A distinguishing characteristic of such text is that it is composed of discrete steps to be performed in a strict sequence, with an implicit end product or goal.

Protagonist: the central character of a short story, novel, or narrative poem. The antagonist is the character who stands directly opposed to the protagonist.

Purpose: the specific reason or reasons for the writing. It conveys what the readers have to gain by reading the selection. Purpose is the objective or the goal that the writer wishes to establish.

Repetition: the deliberate use of any element of language more than once—sound, word, phrase, sentence, grammatical pattern, or rhythmical pattern.

Rhetoric: the art of using words to persuade in writing or speaking.

Rhetorical device: a technique used by writers to persuade an audience.

Rhyme: the repetition of sounds in two or more words or phrases, which appear close to each other in a poem. *End rhyme* occurs at the end of lines; *internal rhyme*, within a line. *Slant rhyme* is approximate rhyme. A *rhyme scheme* is the pattern of end rhymes.

Rhythm: the regular recurrence and speed of sound and stresses in a poem or work of prose.

Sarcasm: the use of verbal irony in which a person appears to be praising something but is actually insulting it.

Satire: a piece of prose in which witty language is used to convey insults or scorn

Sequence: a text structure in which ideas are grouped on the basis of order or time.

Setting: the time and place in which events in a short story, novel, or narrative poem take place.

Simile: a comparison of two different things or ideas through the use of the words “like” or “as”.

Sonnet: a fourteen-line lyric poem, usually written in iambic pentameter.

Stanza: a division of a poem, composed of two or more lines.

Style: the writer’s characteristic manner of employing language.

Symbol: an object, person, place, or action that has both a meaning in itself and that stands for something larger than itself, such as a quality, attitude, belief, or value.

Syntax: the arrangement of words and the order of grammatical elements in a sentence.

Tall Tale: an improbable, incredible or fanciful story.

Theme: the central meaning of a literary work. A literary work can have more than one theme. Most themes are not directly stated, but are implied. A literary theme is not the same as a topic.

Tone: the writer’s or speaker’s attitude toward a subject, character, or audience conveyed through the author’s choice of words and detail. Tone can be serious, humorous, sarcastic, objective, etc.

Trait: a distinguishing feature, as of a person’s character.

Understatement: a kind of irony that deliberately represents something as being much less than it really is; the opposite of hyperbole or overstatement.

Voice: the distinctive style or manner of expression of an author or of a character.

APPENDIX B

SPECIAL STUDIES: 2009 NAEP READING FRAMEWORK

SPECIAL STUDIES

2009 NAEP READING FRAMEWORK

Three special studies have been proposed as part of the development of the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework. Although very different in topic, they have the common goals of improving the quality of the NAEP assessment and gaining maximum information about student achievement in reading. One of the special studies—meaning vocabulary—if conducted prior to the administration of the 2009 assessment, can inform test development by providing information about new item types. Other studies propose using data gained from the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment to examine English learners’ reading achievement as well as factors that have an impact on the gender gap in reading. Further details about the special studies, including methodology, will appear in the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment Specifications document. The special studies are presented in priority order, from highest to lowest.

DEVELOPMENTAL STUDY: MEANING VOCABULARY ASSESSMENT

Purpose

Looking toward the addition of meaning vocabulary items to the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment, this developmental study will evaluate the reliability and the construct, content, criterion, and concurrent validity of the proposed method of measuring meaning vocabulary. The study will be conducted well in advance of the 2009 administration, to inform the development and use of meaning vocabulary items on NAEP.

Rationale

Although NAEP has included a few vocabulary test items in the context of passages on past assessments, the number of items was scant and there were no specific vocabulary criteria for selecting the items or distractors. Further, past reports from NAEP provided little information on how students performed on the vocabulary items and whether that performance was associated with comprehension achievement levels; thus, these reports did not provide a foundation for emphasizing the importance of vocabulary to reading comprehension. The importance of vocabulary in reading comprehension, as supported by research, will be much more widely understood and disseminated with

- NAEP’s initiative specifying vocabulary as a major component of reading comprehension;
- NAEP reports providing quantitative data about the performance of 4th, 8th, and 12th grade students on meaning vocabulary questions and the developmental differences among grades; and
- NAEP reports describing the differences between Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic readers on vocabulary, and the implications of these differences.

Recognizing a growing body of research that supports the argument that vocabulary is crucial to reading comprehension, the 2009 NAEP Reading Assessment will include a measure of vocabulary. All vocabulary items will function both as a measure of comprehension of the passage in which the word is included and as a test of readers' specific knowledge of the word's meaning as intended by the passage author. NAEP will include a sufficient number of items to provide reliable and valid data for analysis and interpretation. A description of the criteria for word selection and number of items appear in Chapter 2 of the 2009 NAEP Reading Framework and will be elaborated in the Specifications document to be developed after approval of the Framework.

Research Questions

1. What is the correlation between reading comprehension and meaning vocabulary items, and how does the addition of meaning vocabulary items affect overall scores on the NAEP Reading Assessment?
2. How does the introduction of meaning vocabulary items affect the scores of ethnically, socioeconomically, and geographically varying groups and low-, average-, and high-performing readers?
3. What is the correlation between scores on the meaning vocabulary items and a vocabulary test such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, 3rd Edition (PPVT-III)? Answers to this question will address the concurrent validity of NAEP's vocabulary measure.

SPECIAL STUDY: ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

Purpose

This special study will examine the patterns of achievement among English language learner (ELL) students and the link between NAEP scores and other indicators of students' ability and achievement, as well as the effects of the accommodations afforded students in these groups.

Rationale

In today's schools, the number of English language learners is on the rise. This population trend has implications for reading instruction and assessment as educators seek better ways to teach and evaluate their ELL students—clearly, we require more information about language and its relationship to reading comprehension and meaning vocabulary, a link indicated by past studies.

Although past NAEP reports have provided scores by ethnicity, they have not provided information about the link between language minority students and reading ability. This special study seeks to examine this link, informing the discussion of how to develop a dynamic assessment (adaptive testing) that more accurately maps the achievement of U.S. students.⁶²

⁶²The English language learner special study may be informed by the results of the National Literacy Panel's study on language minority children and youth. The NLP is conducting a comprehensive review of research on the development of literacy among language minority children and youth, to be completed in 2004.

Research Questions

1. What miscues occur most frequently among different groups of English language learners, and are these miscues consistent with different groups of English learners' speech?
2. Are tests of English language proficiency predictive of NAEP comprehension and vocabulary scores?
3. What are the differential effects of English proficiency level on NAEP reading and vocabulary?
4. How are reclassified fluent English proficient students (RFEP) achieving in comparison to other groups in reading comprehension and vocabulary, and how do they progress after one, two, or three years of reclassification?
5. At what minimum level of English proficiency is a student able to take a NAEP reading assessment written in English?
6. Do accommodations given to ELL students give access to or change the construct of the test?

SPECIAL STUDY: GENDER DIFFERENCES

Purpose

This special study examines the differences in reading achievement between boys and girls, focusing on factors that are associated with the gender gap in reading.

Rationale

The gender gap—a significant difference between the performance or achievement of boys versus girls—exists in a number of education-related settings and situations. Girls generally have higher high school graduation rates, college admission rates, and enrollment in Advanced Placement courses in the humanities, whereas boys have a higher incidence of diagnosed reading disorders. Although boys generally have higher mathematics and science achievement, the gender gap in the language arts favors girls. Results from the 2002 NAEP Reading Assessment indicate the following:

- The score gap between male and female grade 4 students in 2002 was smaller than in 2000, but it was not found to be significantly different from that in 1992.
- The score gap between boys and girls at grade 8 was smaller in 2002 than in all prior assessment years.
- The score gap between grade 12 boys and girls in 2002 is greater than it was in 1992.
- Girls outperformed boys at all three grades in 2002.

As educators continue to grapple with the gender gap's implications for instruction and assessment, this special study will examine variables in NAEP's assessment design and their relationship to the gender gap in reading. This study will look specifically at the NAEP assessment design and at achievement data gathered from the 2009 administration of the assessment.

Research Questions

1. How are question response modes (e.g., multiple choice, constructed response) related to reading achievement?
2. How are the types of texts (e.g., narrative, information, poetry) related to reading achievement?
3. How is the content of the selection (e.g., gender of main character, different themes, presence of moral) related to reading achievement?

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE PASSAGES AND ITEMS

NOTE: The final version of the Framework will contain sample passages and items for all grades, various text types, and cognitive targets.

SAMPLE VOCABULARY ITEMS

This draft version illustrates the approach to vocabulary assessment recommended in the Framework by presenting the following:

1. A listing of words that were identified as likely candidates for item development from a released grade 8 NAEP passage, Dorothea Dix: Quiet Crusader
2. Sample constructed-response items
3. Sample multiple-choice items
4. The passage about which items were developed

Candidate Words for Item Development

- She had such a tremendous **impact** on nineteenth century America.
- ... a **neglectful** father
- ... angry at this **neglect** on the part of the authorities
- ... and a mother who had trouble **coping** with daily activities
- ... her grandmother, a cold, **inflexible** woman
- ... taught her the **organizational** skills to help her do [her duty].
- The memorial caused an **uproar**
- Gradually, the personal attacks **abated**, primarily because Dix’s research had been so thorough
- ... she knew what kind of opposition to expect, and she could help **deflect** it
- She also left a **legacy** of concern

Sample Constructed-Response Item to Assess Vocabulary

The text says that Dorothea had a tremendous **impact** on nineteenth-century America. **Impact** can mean *effect* or *influence* or it can mean *two things hitting each other*. Tell which meaning **impact** has in this passage and tell how you know this is the meaning.

Sample Multiple-Choice Items

The text says that personal attacks on Dorothea **abated**. The word **abated** means that

- a. the attacks became violent.
- *b. there were fewer attacks.
- c. people said rude things about her.
- d. the police began to protect her.

The text says that when Dorothea knew what kind of opposition to expect, she could **deflect** it. The word **deflect** means that Dorothea could

- a. avoid people who did not agree with her.
- *b. create arguments to convince people to help her.
- c. write articles that all people could read.
- d. be very polite to people who argued with her.

The text says that Dorothea Dix left a **legacy of concern**. What does the phrase **legacy of concern** mean in the passage?

- *a. Dorothea was able to get people very concerned about solving a problem.
- b. Dorothea left many important problems unsolved when she died.
- c. Dorothea left ways of thinking about the issues that concerned her.
- d. Dorothea set examples of ways for people to help each other.

DOROTHEA DIX: QUIET CRUSADER

BY LUCIE GERMER

Dorothea Dix was so shy and quiet that it is hard to believe she had such a tremendous **impact** on nineteenth-century America. Yet almost single-handedly, she transformed the way people with mental illness were treated.

Dorothea was born in Maine in 1802 to a **neglectful** father and a mother who had trouble **coping** with daily activities. She ran away at the age of twelve to live with her grandmother, a cold, **inflexible** woman who nevertheless taught her the importance of doing her duty, as well as the **organizational** skills to help her do it.

Dorothea grew into an attractive woman, with blue-gray eyes, wavy brown hair, and a rich, low speaking voice. As a young adult, she spent her time teaching, writing books for children, and fighting the effects of tuberculosis. Despite her poor health, by age thirty-nine, she had saved enough money so that she had no financial worries. Afraid that her health was too poor for her to continue teaching, she looked forward to a lonely, unfulfilling life.

Then a friend suggested that she teach a Sunday school class for women in a Massachusetts jail. It would be useful without overtaxing her. On her first day, she discovered that among the inmates were several mentally ill women. They were anxious to hear what she had to say, but she found it impossible to teach them because the room was unheated. Dix, angry at this **neglect** on the part of the authorities, asked noted humanitarian Samuel Howe for his help in taking the case to court. The court ordered the authorities to install a wood stove.

This sparked Dix's interest in the ways mentally ill people were treated. Encouraged by Howe and education reformer Horace Mann, she spent two years visiting every asylum, almshouse, and jail in Massachusetts, quietly taking notes on the conditions. Her grandmother had trained her to be thorough, and the training paid off.

Dix put her findings into a memorial (a report) that Howe presented to the Massachusetts legislature: "I tell what I have seen. . . . [I]nsane persons confined . . . in cages, closets, cellars, stalls, pens; chained, naked, beaten with rods and lashed into obedience."

The memorial caused an **uproar**: What kind of woman would be interested in such a subject and insist on discussing it in public? Gradually, the personal attacks **abated**, primarily because Dix's research had been so thorough and her results were so complete that no one could argue with them. Howe was able to push a bill through the Massachusetts legislature to enlarge the state asylum.

Dix spent the next few years systematically studying conditions and getting legislation passed in other states. Her health did not keep her from putting in long hours of hard work and travel. First, she studied the psychological and legal views of mental illness and its treatment. Before she went into a state, she examined local laws and previous proposals for change. Then she visited every institution, small or large, and met with administrators, politicians, and private citizens. She put all this information together in a memorial that was presented to the legislature. She also wrote newspaper articles to inform the public of her findings. By this time, she knew what kind of

opposition to expect, and she could help **deflect** it by appealing to the citizens' sense of pride or desire for economy. She also met privately with small groups of politicians to answer their questions and try to persuade them to come around to her point of view. She was usually successful, and public institutions to house and treat people with mental illness were established.

Unfortunately, that success did not carry over to her next goal: national legislation to improve the living conditions for people with mental illness. In the 1850s, Congress passed a bill setting aside land for the establishment of national hospitals for those with mental illness, but President Franklin Pierce vetoed the bill on constitutional grounds.

Dix was shattered. Her health, which had been surprisingly good during her struggles, took a turn for the worse, and doctors recommended she take a long voyage. Dix was unable to relax, however, and her vacation turned into a marathon journey through Europe, as she examined the living conditions of mentally ill people in each place she visited. She spoke with doctors, government officials, and even the pope, pleading for humanitarian treatment for those who were mentally ill. She went as far east as Constantinople (now Istanbul) in Turkey and as far north as St. Petersburg (now Leningrad) in Russia. She was greeted respectfully everywhere she went, and many of her recommendations were followed.

She returned to the United States in 1857 and was appointed superintendent of women nurses during the Civil War. Dix was the only woman to hold an official position in the U.S. government during the war.

After the war, Dix continued her work on behalf of mentally ill people both in the United States and abroad. She died in 1887 at the age of eighty-five. Between 1841, when she began her crusade, and the year she died, thirty-two new hospitals for those who were mentally ill were built, most of them directly because she had brought the problem to the attention of people in power. Several other institutions in Canada and Europe, and even two in Japan, were established because of her influence. She also left a **legacy of concern**: No longer was mental illness treated as a crime, and her enlightened and tireless work led to more humane living conditions for people with mental illness.

From *Cobblestone* June 1989 issue: *People With Disabilities*. © 1989. Cobblestone Publishing Inc., Peterborough, NH 03458. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

APPENDIX D

REFERENCES CONSULTED IN DEVELOPING THE 2009 NAEP READING FRAMEWORK

REFERENCES CONSULTED IN DEVELOPING THE 2009 NAEP READING FRAMEWORK

DEFINITION OF READING

- Campbell, J.R., Kelly, D.L., Mullis, I.V.S., Martin, M.O., & Sainsbury, M. (2001, March). *Framework and specifications for PIRLS Assessment 2001*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College, Lynch School of Education, PIRLS International Study Center.
- Lyon, G.R. (1998). Overview of reading and literacy research. In S. Patton & M. Holmes (Eds.), *The keys to literacy*. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel*. Washington, DC: Author.
- No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, P.L. 107-110, signed by President George W. Bush, January 8, 2002.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2000). *Measuring student knowledge and skill: The PISA 2000 assessment of reading, mathematical and scientific literacy*. Paris: Author.
- RAND Reading Study Group (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Ruddell, R.B., & Unrau, N.J. (1994). Reading as a meaning-construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading*, (4th ed., pp. 996–1056). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

TEXT TYPES, MATRICES, AND COGNITIVE TARGETS

- Achieve (2004). Executive summary of the American Diploma Project. Washington, DC: Author.
- Alexander, P.A., & Jetton, T.L. (2000). Learning from text: A multidimensional and developmental perspective. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 285–310). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Armbruster, B.B. (1984). The problem of “inconsiderate text.” In G.G. Duffy, I.R. Roehler, & J. Mason, (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Perspective and suggestion* (pp. 202–217). New York: Longman.
- Barr, R., Kamil, M.L., Mosenthal, P.B., & Pearson, P.D. (Eds.). (1991). *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

-
- Bauman, J. (1986). Effect of rewritten textbook passages on middle-grade students' comprehension of main ideas: Making the inconsiderate considerate. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 18, 1–22.
- Bauman, J.F., Kame'enui, E.J., & Ash, G.E. (2002). Research on vocabulary instruction: Voltaire redux. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, D.R. Squire, & J. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the teaching of the English language arts* (pp. 752–785). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Beck, I., McKeown, M., & Worthy, J. (1995). Giving a text voice can improve students' understanding. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 220–238.
- Bovair, S., & Kieras, D.E. (1991). Toward a model of acquiring procedures from text. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 206–229). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Broer, N.A., Aarnoutse, C.A.J., Kieviet, F.K., & Van Leeuwe, J.F.J. (2002). The effect of instructing the structural aspect of texts. *Educational Studies*, 28(3), 213–238.
- Burke, J. (2000). *Reading reminders: Tools, tips, and techniques*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Burke, J. (2001). *Illuminating texts: How to teach students to read the world*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Driver, R., Newton, P., & Osborne, J. (2000). Establishing the norms of scientific argumentation in classrooms. *International Journal of Science Education*, 84, 287–312.
- Duke, N.K. (2000). 3.6 minutes per day: The scarcity of information texts in first grade. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35, 202–224.
- Fludernik, M. (2000). Genres, text types, or discourse modes? Narrative modalities and generic categorization. *Style*, 34(2), 274–292.
- Garner, R. (1982). Verbal-report data on reading strategies. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 14, 159–167.
- Georgiou, C. (1988). *Children and their literature*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gioia, D., Kennedy, X.J., & Bauerlein, M. (2004). *Handbook of literary terms*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Goldman, S., & Rakestraw, J. (2000). Structural aspects of constructing meaning from text. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 311–335). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Graesser, A., Golding, J.M., & Long, D.L. (1991). Narrative representation and comprehension. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 171–205). White Plains, NY: Longman.
-

-
- Guthrie, J., Britten, T., & Barker, K. (1991). Roles of document structure, cognitive strategy, and awareness in searching for information. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25, 300–324.
- Guthrie, J.T., & Mosenthal, P. (1987). Literacy as multidimensional: Learning information and reading comprehension. *Educational Psychologist*, 22(3–4), 279–297.
- Hanauer, D.I. (in press). What we know about reading poetry: Theoretical positions and empirical research. In G. Steen & D. Schram (Eds.), *The psychology and sociology of literary text*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.
- Kamil, M.L., Kim, H.S., & Lane, D. (in press). Electronic text. In J. Hoffman & D. Schallert (Eds.), *The texts in the primary grade classrooms*. Ann Arbor MI: Center for Instruction in Early Literacy Acquisition.
- Kamil, M.L., Mosenthal, P.B., Pearson, P.D., & Barr, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kim, H.S., & Kamil, M.L. (2003). Reading electronic and multimedia text. In A. Sweet & C. Snow (Eds.), *Rethinking reading comprehension* (pp. 166–175). New York: Guilford.
- Kirsch, I.S., & Mosenthal, P.B. (1990). Exploring document literacy: Variables underlying the performance of young adults. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25, 5–30.
- Kobayashi, M. (2002). Method effects on reading comprehension test performance: Text organization and response format. *Language Testing*, 19, 193–220.
- Leu, D.J., Jr., & Kinzer, C.K. (2000). The convergence of literacy instruction with networked technologies for information and communication. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35, 108–127.
- Meyer, B.J.F. (1975). *The organization of prose and its effects in memory*. New York: Elsevier.
- Meyer, B.J.F. (2003). Text coherence and readability. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 23(3), 204–224.
- Mosenthal, P.B. (1996). Understanding the strategies of document literacy and their conditions of use. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 88, 314–332.
- Mosenthal, P.B. (1998). Defining prose task characteristics for use in computer-adaptive testing and instruction. *American Education Research Journal*, 35, 269–307.
- Norris, S., & Phillips, L.M. (1987). Explorations at reading comprehension: Schema theory and critical thinking theory. *Teachers College Record*, 38, 281–306.
- Olvshavsky, J. (1976-77). Reading as problem solving: An investigation of strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 12, 654–674.

-
- Paris, S.G., Wasik, B.A., & Turner, C.J. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 609–640). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Pearson, P.D., & Camperell, K. (1994). Comprehension of text structures. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 448–468). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Pressley, M. (2000). What should comprehension instruction be the instruction of? In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 545–586). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Purves, A.C. (1973). *Literature education in ten countries*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell and New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ravitch, D. (2003). *The language police: How pressure groups restrict what students learn*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Robb, L., Klemp, R., & Schwartz, W. (2002). *Reader's handbook: A student guide for reading and learning*. Wilmington, MA: Great Source Education Group.
- Stein, N.L., & Glenn, C.G. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In R.O. Freedle (Ed.), *New directions in discourse processing* (pp. 53–120). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1991). Are we reading too much into reading tests? *Journal of Reading*, 34, 540–545.
- Vacca, J., & Vacca, R. (1999). *Content area reading: Literacy and learning across the curriculum* (6th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Wade, S., Buxton, W., & Kelly, M. (1999). Using think-alouds to examine reader-text interest. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34(2), 194–213.
- Wade, S., Schraw, G., Buxton, W., & Hayes, M. (1993). Seduction of the strategic reader: Effects of interest on strategy and recall. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28(2), 92–114.
- Wade, S.E., & Moje, E.B. (2000). The role of text in classroom learning. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 609–627). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Weaver, C.A., III, & Kintsch, W. (1991). Expository text. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 230–245). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Wineburg, S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28, 495-519.

Wixson, K.K., & Peters, C.W. (1987). Comprehension assessment: Implementing an interactive view of reading. *American Psychologist*, 23, 333–356.

Zohar, A., & Nemet, F. (2003). Fostering students' knowledge and argumentation skills through dilemmas in human genetics. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 39(1), 35–62.

VOCABULARY ASSESSMENT

Barzun, J. (1975). *Simple and direct*. New York: Harper & Row.

Baumann, J.F., Kame'enui, E.J., & Ash, G.E. (2002). Research on vocabulary instruction: Voltaire redux. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, J.R. Squire, & J.M. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (pp. 752–785). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Beck, I.J., McKeown, M.G., & Omanson, R.C. (1987). The effects and use of diverse vocabulary instructional techniques. In M.G. McKeown & M. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 147–163). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Beck, I.L., Perfetti, C.A., & McKeown, M.G. (1982). Effects of long-term vocabulary instruction on lexical access and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(4), 506–521.

Blachowicz, C.L.Z., & Fisher, P. (2000). Vocabulary instruction. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 503–523). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Brown, R.W. (1958). *Words and things*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Calfee, R.C., & Drum, P.A. (1985). Research in teaching reading. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook on teaching*, (3rd ed., pp. 804–849). New York: Macmillan.

Carney, J.J., Anderson, D., Blackburn, C., & Blessing, D. (1984). Preteaching vocabulary and the comprehension of social studies materials by elementary school children. *Social Education*, 48(3), 195–196.

Carver, R.P. (1994). Percentage of unknown vocabulary words in text as a function of the relative difficulty of the text: Implications for instruction. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 26, 413–437.

Cunningham, A.E., & Stanovich, K.E. (1998). What reading does for the mind. *American Educator*, 22(1/2), 8–15.

Davis, F.B. (1944). Fundamental factors in reading comprehension. *Psychometrika*, 9, 185–197.

Davis, F.B. (1968). Research on comprehension in reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 3, 449–545.

-
- Davis, F.B. (1972). Psychometric research on comprehension in reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 7, 628–678.
- Deegan, D.H. (1995). Exploring individual differences among novices reading in a specific domain: The case of law. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(2), 154–170.
- Halldorson, M., & Singer, M. (2002). Inference processes: Integrating relevant knowledge and text information. *Discourse Processes*, 34(2), 145–161.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T.R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Baltimore: Brookes Publishing Company.
- Jenkins, J.R., & Pany, D. (1981). Instructional variables in reading comprehension. In J.T. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews* (pp. 163–202). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Johnson-Laird, P.N. (1987). The mental representation of the meaning of words. *Cognition*, 25, 189–211.
- Kintsch, W. (1974). *The representation of meaning in memory*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kintsch, W. (1986). Learning from text. *Cognition and Instruction*, 3, 87–108.
- Klare, G.R. (1984). Readability. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. I, pp. 681–744). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Koury, K. A. (1996). The impact of preteaching science content vocabulary using integrated media for knowledge acquisition in a collaborative classroom. *Journal of Computing in Childhood Education*, 7(3–4), 179–197.
- Landauer, T.K., Foltz, P.W., & Laham, D. (1998). An introduction to latent semantic analysis. *Discourse Processes*, 25, 259–284.
- McKeown, M.G., Beck, I.L., Omanson, R.C., & Perfetti, C.A. (1983). The effects of long-term vocabulary instruction on reading comprehension: A replication. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 15(1), 3–18.
- Medo, M.A., & Ryder, R.J. (1993). The effects of vocabulary instruction on readers' ability to make causal connections. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 33(2), 119–134.
- Mezynski, K. (1983). Issues concerning the acquisition of knowledge: Effects of vocabulary training on reading comprehension. *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 253–279.
- Miller, G.A. (1991). *The science of words*. New York: Scientific American Library.

-
- Nagy, W.E., & Herman, P.A. (1987). Breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge: Implications for acquisition and instruction. In M.G. McKeown & M.E. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 19–35). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nagy, W.E., & Scott, J.A. (2000). Vocabulary processes. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 269–284). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nation, P., & Coady, J. (1988). Vocabulary and reading. In R. Carter & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary and language teaching* (pp. 97–110). New York: Longman.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: Reports of the subgroups*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- Nutall, G., & Alton-Lee, A. (1995). Assessing classroom learning: How students use their knowledge and experience to answer classroom achievement text questions in science and social studies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(1), 185–223.
- Olshavsky, J.I. (1977). Reading as problem solving. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 7(4), 654–674.
- Omanon, R.C., Beck, I.L., McKeown, M.G., & Perfetti, C.A. (1984). Comprehension of texts with unfamiliar versus recently taught words: Assessment of alternative models. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(6) 1253–1268.
- Ryder, R.J., & Graves, M.F. (1994). Vocabulary instruction presented prior to reading in two basal readers. *Elementary School Journal*, 95(2), 139–153.
- Simon, H.A., & Siklóssy, L. (1972). Use of context in determining meaning. In H.A. Simon & L. Siklóssy (Eds.), *Representation and meaning: Experiments with information processing systems* (pp. 207–209). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Spearritt, D. (1972). Identification of subskills and reading comprehension by maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 8, 92–111.
- Spearritt, D. (1977). Measuring reading comprehension in the upper primary school. *Australian Journal of Reading*, 3, 67–75.
- Stahl, S.A. (1983). Differential word knowledge and reading comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 56(1), 72–110.
- Stahl, S.A. (1991). Beyond the instrumentalist hypothesis: Some relationships between word meanings and comprehension. In P.J. Schwanenflugel (Ed.), *The psychology of word meanings* (pp. 157–186). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stahl, S.A. (1999). *Vocabulary development*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

-
- Stahl, S.A., & Fairbanks, M.M. (1986). The effects of vocabulary instruction: A model-based meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 56(1), 72–110.
- Stahl, S.A., & Jacobson, M.G. (1986). Vocabulary difficulty, prior knowledge, and test comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 18, 309–329.
- Stahl, S.A., Jacobson, M.G., Davis, C.E., & Davis, R.L. (1989). Prior knowledge and difficulty in the comprehension of unfamiliar text. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24(1), 27–43.
- Sternberg, R.J., & Powell, J.S. (1983). Comprehending verbal comprehension. *American Psychologist* 38, 878–893.
- Thorndike, E.L. (1917). Reading as reasoning: A study of mistakes in paragraph reading. *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, 8(6), 323–332.
- Thorndike, R.L. (1973). *Reading comprehension education in fifteen countries: An empirical study*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Thorndike, R.L. (1973–74). Reading as reasoning. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 9, 135–147.
- Thurstone, L.L. (1946). Note on a reanalysis of Davis' reading tests. *Psychometrika*, 11(3), 185–188.
- Trabasso, T., & Magliano, J. (1996). How do children understand what they read and what can we do to help them? In M. Graves, P. van den Broek, & B. Taylor (Eds.), *The first r: A right of all children* (pp. 160–188). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- White, S., & Clement, J. (August 2001). *Assessing the Lexile framework: Results of a panel meeting, Working Paper No. 2001-08*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Wixson, K. (1986). Vocabulary instruction and children's comprehension of basal stories. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21(3), 317–329.

APPENDIX E

NAEP READING PROJECT STAFF,
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

APPENDIX E

NAEP READING PROJECT STAFF AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

Terry Salinger

Chief Scientist
Project Director

Ramsay Selden

Vice President for Assessment
Chair of Steering Committee

Steve Ferrara

Managing Director
Chair, Technical Advisory Panel

George Bohrnstedt

Senior Vice President
Senior Advisor

Amy Bacevich

Research Associate

Julia MacMillan

Research Analyst

Laura Walton

Research Assistant